

POSTAGE, Paid in Advance, 4 Cts. per No. or 16 Cts. per Year.

DANVILLE REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

In Association of Ministers.

JUNE, 1863.

Φωτισματος δὲ ζωῆς καὶ ἀρετῆς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

DANVILLE, KY.

PRINTED FOR THE ASSOCIATION AND SOLD BY

MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,

25 WEST FOURTH STREET,

CINCINNATI.

SOLD ALSO BY WM. S. & A. MARTIN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT CARTER &
BROTHERS, NEW YORK; LITTLE, BROWN & CO., BOSTON;
KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; BIBLE AND
TRACT HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1861, by JACOB COOPER, for the Association,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. IV.— <i>The Exodus; Pass-over; Priesthood; Borrowing the Jewels.</i> By Rev. E. P. Humphrey, D. D.,	181
II.—THE ELEMENT OF ADMONITION IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Rev. N. C. Burt, D. D.,	205
III.—THE PERIL AND DUTY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, WITH RESPECT TO THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE COUNTRY, IMPENDING WAR WITH ENGLAND AND FRANCE, AND THE THREATENED HUMILIATION AND PARTITION OF THE UNITED STATES. By Rev. Ro. J. Breckinridge, D. D.,	217
IV.—CHAPLAINCY IN THE ARMY. By Rev. R. W. Landis, D. D.,	255
V.—THE PURITANS AND THEIR PRINCIPLES, BY EDWIN HALL. <i>New York: Chas. Scribner. 1851.</i> By Rev. Robert Johnstone,	288
VI.—THE TRUE MISSION OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. R. L. Stanton, D. D.,	311
VII.—A MANUAL OF WORSHIP SUITABLE TO BE USED IN LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER PUBLIC BODIES, IN THE ARMY AND NAVY, AND IN MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES, ASYLUMS, HOSPITALS, ETC., COMPILED FROM THE FORMS AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COMMON USAGES OF ALL CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS, AND JOINTLY RECOMMENDED BY EMINENT CLERGYMEN OF VARIOUS PERSUASIONS. <i>pp. 182. George W. Childs, Philadelphia. 1862.</i> By R. W. Landis, D. D.,	341

Volumes I and II, of this work, may be obtained of the Publishers at \$2.50 per volume, or Volumes I, II, and III at \$6 for the set in numbers.

DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. II.

JUNE, 1863.

ART. I.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. IV. *The Exodus; Passover; Priesthood; Borrowing the Jewels.**

ONE of the leading epochs in sacred history was formed by the departure of the Hebrews from the land of Egypt. The chosen seed was originally in a succession of individuals: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In the children of Jacob the visible church expanded into a family. The sojourn in Egypt consolidated the separate clans into the unity of a common life; and the exodus transformed twelve tribes of bondsmen, apparently helpless, into a nation of kings and priests, powerful in numbers and resources, compacted together by a community of race and traditions, and inspired by the sense of an exalted destiny.

In order to obtain a clear insight into the narrative of the exodus, it is necessary to appreciate what was peculiar in the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, and in the incidents

*HELPS TO THE STUDY.—*On the Passover*: Hengstenberg's Auth. Pent. 2: 294. Witsius' Covenants, B. IV, chap. ix. M'Donald's Pent. 1: 209, 2: 268-272. Kurtz' Old Cov't. 2: 294-311. Fairbairn's Typol. 2: 404. Kitto's Cyclo. Art. "Pass-over." Orme's Lord's Supper, 10-27. McGee's Atone. Disserta. 35. Bib. Sac. 1845. p. 405. Calvin's Harm. Pent. 1: 220, 456, 458.

The Priesthood, etc.: Kurtz, 3: 203-6. Fairbairn, 2: 244-275. Hengstenberg, 2: 329-340.

Borrowing the Jewels: Hengstenberg, 2: 417. Kurtz, 2: 319. McDonald, 2: 57. Calvin on Ex. iii: 22 and xi: 2. Rosenmüller on Ex. iii: 22. Kitto Art. "Weights and Measures." Arbuthnot's Tables. Hebrew Concordance sub voce *Shahel*.

connected therewith. Before the series of plagues began, Jehovah gave this commission to Moses: "Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my first-born; and I say unto thee, Let my son go that he may serve me; and if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." Ex. iv: 22, 23. From these words it appears, first, that the destruction of the first-born was, from the beginning, contemplated as the crowning act in the series of calamities about to be inflicted on Egypt. The preceding plagues were, therefore, merely preliminary to that. The nine were in the nature of warnings, the tenth was a work of final judgment. That destruction, secondly, was relevant to the sin of Egypt; according to a well-known principle in the divine government whereby the leading characteristic of the sin is reiterated in the leading characteristic of the punishment; as in the law of retaliation, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The oppression of Israel, God's first-born son, was the crime—the destruction of the first-born sons of the oppressors, was the penalty. The visitation, thirdly, was purely supernatural. Unlike most of the other wonders, it did not rest on any natural basis; that is to say, it was not a curse native-born to the country, under a form intensely aggravated by the power of God, but it was altogether a strange terror; a species of retribution never before employed, never since repeated. To this it should be added, fourthly, that the plague was not introduced by human intervention. During the progress of the ten wonders, the ministries engaged rose in dignity. The first three were brought forward by the instrumentality of Aaron in the use of his rod; at the fourth, and thence onward, the most prominent part was assigned to Moses; but in the tenth Moses warned the Hebrews that it was impending, and then stepped aside at the approach of the Jehovah-Angel. It was, therefore, an immediate manifestation of supernatural power. God had said to the king, "I will slay thy son, even thy first-born."

Among the incidents connected with this visitation of God, the institution of the Passover was, perhaps, the most important. By divine command, each family of the Hebrews selected, on the tenth day of the current month, a lamb or a kid without blemish, a male of the first year. On the fourteenth

day of the month, at evening, it was killed; its blood was sprinkled upon the door-posts and lintels of the house; the body of the lamb was roasted entire, and eaten by the whole family with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. They partook of the repast in haste, with their loins girded, sandals on their feet, and staff in hand, ready, at a given signal, to set off for Canaan. About midnight the Almighty went through the land smiting the first-born of Egypt, but passing over the houses the door-posts of which were marked with the blood of the paschal lamb. Hence the ceremony was called the feast of the Passover, and it was appointed to be observed annually, as a perpetual ordinance. Various amendments were afterward introduced into the law of the Passover, adapted to a settled church-state; but these need not be dwelt upon in this place. The fundamental ordinance may be found in Ex. xii: 1-20; the persons allowed to be present are described in xii: 43-49; the original ordinance is abridged in xxiii: 15, in xxxiv: 18, and in Lev. xxiii: 4; further directions as to the communicants are contained in Num. ix: 1-4; and the sacrifices associated with the feast are mentioned in Num. xxviii: 16-25; and the final form of the ritual, adapted to the Mosaic institutes of worship and to the condition of the church in Canaan is of record in Dent. xvi: 1-12.

Nothing is more strictly defined in these Scriptures, than the relation between the shedding of blood and the redemption of Israel from the destruction of the first-born. The Hebrews as well as the Egyptians had been guilty of idolatry; therefore the first three plagues were laid upon both people alike. Afterward the Hebrews were spared while the Egyptians were punished. But in the final execution of judgment, a new principle was associated with the grace by which the chosen seed were saved from death; the principle of redemption by the shedding and sprinkling of blood. The victim divinely selected was a lamb or a kid without blemish; the officiating priest, in the absence of a sacerdotal order, was the head of the family; the altar, in the absence of a public place of sacrifice, was the doorway of the house; the sprinkling of the blood upon the lintels and door-posts was an act of obedience to God, and of faith in his promise; the passing over of the houses which were marked by the blood, was an act of

God having respect unto his own way of salvation; and the whole was a true expiation for sin, offered by the sinner, and accepted by the Sovereign Judge. "And the blood," said Jehovah, "shall be to you a token upon the houses where ye are: and *when I see the blood*, I will pass over you." Ex. xii: 13. Comp. xii: 23. Some of the cardinal principles which enter into the salvation of the Gospel are fully expressed in this transaction. God will have a chosen people to serve him; the subjects of this saving grace must be chosen not only, but redeemed as well; this redemption is effected by the blood of the Lamb; the shed blood must be appropriated to himself, by an act of faith on the part of the sinner; and when the Almighty, coming to judge the wicked, "*sees the blood*," he will pass over his chosen, redeemed and believing people.

It is a fact, every way remarkable, that some of the soundest of the early Protestant theologians would not admit that the Passover was, strictly speaking, a sacrificial institute. It was a sacrament, they alleged, not a sacrifice. They were driven to this position by what appeared to them to be a polemical necessity. The Roman Catholic divines constructed an argument, which began with the proposition that the Passover was a true sacrifice for sin, and terminated in the conclusion that the Lord's Supper, being both its substitute and antitype, was also a sacrifice for sin. A conclusive reply to this argument might have been found in two suggestions. So far as the question turns upon the fact that the Lord's Supper is a substitute for the Passover, it is an established principle that one ordinance of worship may take the place of another although they differ in manner and form as widely as baptism differs from circumcision, and the offering of prayer from the burning of incense. And, so far as the question turns on the fact that the Lord's Supper is an antitype of the Passover, the quality of sacrifice which was in the Passover can not appear in the Lord's Supper, for the reason that since the death of Christ there remains no more sacrifice for sin. Heb. vii: 27, ix: 28. But the Protestant theologians, not content with this reply, attempted to cut short the debate by denying, out and out, the sacrificial character of the Passover; and even to this day, traces of this opinion occasionally appear in the writings of approved divines. But this opinion can not be maintained

except in opposition to the concurrent testimonies of the Scriptures. In the first place, the Passover is repeatedly called a sacrifice. It is described in Ex. xii: 27, as the "sacrifice of the Lord's Passover;" in xxxiv: 25, as "the sacrifice of the feast of the Passover;" in Num. ix: 7, as "an offering of the Lord;" and in Deut. xvi: 2-6, equivalent expressions are four times employed. Next, after the building of the tabernacle, the paschal lamb was, by divine command, to be slain only at the place where sacrifice might be offered. Deut. xvi: 4, 5; Ezra vi: 20. Further, both the blood and the fat of the paschal victim were offered by the priest on the altar, according to the invariable law of atonement. 2 Chron. xxx: 15, 16; xxxv: 11, 14. Further still, Paul puts into the same category the slaying of this lamb and the death of Christ: "For even Christ, our Passover" (our paschal lamb, Mark xiv: 12), "is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. v: 7. Finally, in both Philo and Josephus the ceremony is styled *θυσια* and *θυμα*, an expiation for sin. Compare *θυσιν* in 1 Cor. v: 7. Nor do the particulars wherein it differed from other forms of sacrifice invalidate its title to a place among them. The imposition of hands, the service of the Aaronic priesthood, the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the fat on the consecrated altar were omitted from the first Passover; but it is to be remembered that neither the regular priesthood nor the brazen altar were, at that time, in existence. The attitudes of the worshipers, eating the flesh of the lamb in haste, with girded loins, their feet in sandals, and leaning on their staves, were peculiarities which were laid aside after the exodus; the use of unleavened bread and bitter herbs were peculiarities which became permanent in the ordinance. But these incidents, whether permanent or transient, did not deprive the Passover of its sacrificial character—they simply determined it to be a sacrifice of a particular class.

This festival was, moreover, appointed to be the standing commemoration of past deliverance and the type of a future salvation. As a memorial of the past it was observed annually, with the utmost solemnity, through all the ages of the Jewish commonwealth. There were three feasts of convocation, at which all the Jews were required to assemble at Jerusalem; and of these the Passover was the chief. Not only

so, but the day of the festival was marked in the calendar as the beginning of the ecclesiastical year. Ex. xii: 2. This arrangement gave to the Hebrews a double computation of time. The civil year was reckoned from September or October, and the ecclesiastical from March or April; not unlike the method in use in this country, whereby important state papers bear two dates, one running with the vulgar era, and proceeding from the first of January, and the other governed by the Declaration of Independence, and beginning with the fourth day of July. The Jews were required not only to keep the feast, but to perpetuate in the memory of all their generations the great events from which it took its origin. "It shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses." Ex. xii: 26, 27. They were commanded to eat unleavened bread, and indeed to allow no leaven to be found in their houses for seven days, in remembrance of the haste with which their fathers came out of the land of Egypt. Deut. xvi: 3. With bitter herbs were they to eat the flesh of the roasted lamb, in memory, as is commonly supposed, of the hard and bitter bondage from which they were delivered. Ex. i: 14. The festival was, therefore, an enduring monument of the past, a great ordinance of redemption.

But its prospective import was more remarkable; since the things which it foreshadowed were better far than those which it commemorated. The matter of the ordinance was a lamb; the lamb was without blemish; it was slain; it was slain by way of a sacrifice; not a bone of it was broken; and the flesh was eaten by the people of God assembled for the purpose. All this was done, moreover, in memory of a wonderful act of redemption of which God was the author, his chosen seed the subjects, and sprinkled blood the token and the price. This redemption was, still further, two fold, a salvation of the first-born of Israel from the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, and a deliverance of the whole body of the church from its house of bondage. Well might the apostle expound and sum up the whole transaction in those few and weighty words: "Christ our Passover was slain for us." He who can not see

Christ, and him crucified, foreshown in the Passover, could hardly be expected to discern the Lord's body in the sacrament of the Supper.

The terms in which the Passover is described in the Pentateuch conclude directly to the proposition that the ordinance was a sacrament; one of the two sacraments of the Abrahamic covenant. Circumcision was the first in order and was appointed at the giving of the covenant itself. Four hundred and thirty years had elapsed since that memorable transaction; nearly two hundred years had passed since the Almighty made any communication of his will to the chosen seed, whether by vision, by covenant, or by oral revelation; and for nearly a hundred years they had been enslaved and polluted likewise by the heathen. When Jehovah came to the rescue, and the church took to itself power from on high to emerge, as a great nation, from its bondage in Egypt, it pleased God not only to remember his covenant, but to institute a new sign thereof in the form of a second sacrament. The relation of the rite to the Abrahamic covenant is immediate; for, although, like circumcision, it was adopted into the Mosaic institutes, it is older than the Sinaiatic covenant, the Levitical priesthood, and the ceremonial law; it pertains, therefore, to the former covenant. It was a new and further act of worship added to the initiatory rite of circumcision.

The mode of determining whether a particular ordinance is a true sacrament is somewhat circuitous. The Scriptures contain neither the term sacrament nor its equivalent, nor do they define the ordinance itself. The theologians have framed a definition by beginning with the proposition, which is universally accepted, that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are true sacraments. Then by comparison and analysis they have ascertained the properties which are common to these two ceremonies, and which distinguish them also from all other divine ordinances; and out of these elementary ideas they have constructed the definition. The application of this definition to any act of worship, the sacramental character of which is under consideration, terminates the inquiry. Now, the sacramental character of the Passover is to be recognized, first, in the fact that the ordinance was of divine appointment, in the absence of which no observance can be a true sacrament.

Next, the two parts which are essential to every sacrament, namely, the outward visible sign and an inward grace signified thereby, are found in the Passover. The lamb killed, roasted, and eaten with unleavened bread, was the sign. Deliverance from the destruction of the first-born and from bondage in Egypt, was the immediate blessing represented; but redemption from sin by the blood of Christ was the spiritual grace signified and exhibited in the ordinance. Moreover the ministers of the sacrament were divinely appointed; in Egypt the head of the family, and in the final form of the ritual, the priest jointly with the master of the household. Still further, the truths set forth in the symbols are those which are proper to a sacrament. The killing and roasting of the lamb conveyed the idea of an offering made for sin, by the knife and by fire. Its body laid on the table, unbroken and entire, represented the unity of the chosen seed and their communion with God in the sacrificial feast; bitter herbs represented not only their bondage in Egypt, but their own desperate guilt in serving the gods of the heathen. Leaven was the product of incipient corruption, and the symbol of lurking, inbred depravity; and was, therefore, to be put away from the feast and from their houses also. Ex. xii: 15; Lev. ii: 11; Mark viii: 15; 1 Cor. v: 6-8. The burning of what remained after supper—the giving it back to God by fire—indicated that this was not an ordinary meal, nor an ordinary sacrificial feast, but that the flesh of the lamb was set aside from a common to a sacred use. Finally, the gracious affections, proper to a true sacrament, were demanded in the right observance of the Passover. Repentance for sin, represented by the bitter herbs; the putting away of all inworking corruption, represented by the exclusion of the leaven; a joyful sense of union and communion with God, awakened by feeding on the unbroken body of the lamb; and above all, a living faith in the Coming One, the Lamb of God, evidently set forth in the paschal sacrifice: these all were affections suitable to the observance.

This demonstration of the sacramental character in the Passover points distinctly to the Lord's Supper as the rite which has taken its place in the Church. There is a close resemblance in the externals of the ordinances. Both were

instituted a few hours previous to the events which they were respectively appointed to commemorate. Both are festal, social, and symbolical. Each sustains similar relations to its fellow-sacrament; none but the circumcised might come to the Passover, none but the baptised may approach the Lord's table. The Supper, like the Passover, is, by express warrant of Scripture, to be often repeated. 1 Cor. xi: 26. Baptism, on the other hand, following the analogy of circumcision, may not be administered to any one the second time, because both Sacraments, the old and the new, were appointed to be signs of regeneration which can occur but once. The Christian and Jewish Passovers are alike, moreover, in their intimate nature. Both are historical monuments of a great redemption; both are prophetic institutions, the Passover foreshadowing the first coming of Christ, and the Lord's Supper his second coming. The Lord Jesus, slain for sin, was set forth in both; in the old sacrament by the lamb, in the new by the bread and the wine. The sacramental actions in the two are the same—the communicants feeding on the flesh of the lamb in the first, and in the second on the symbols of the body and blood of Christ. Repentance for sin, a joyful faith in the saving efficacy of Christ's blood, and a lively sense of union and communion with God and all the Saints, are the graces suitable to the one and to the other.

Their historical relations lead to the same conclusion. It was while Christ and the disciples were eating the Passover that the Lord's Supper was instituted. The Saviour took the materials that he found on the paschal table, and set them apart as the elements in the new sacrament. Before him was the unleavened bread, the memorial of the afflictions of the church in Egypt and its escape therefrom; this bread he took, saying, "This is my body." Before him was the paschal lamb; its blood had been shed in expiation for sin under the provisions of the Old Covenant; he took the wine and said: "This cup is the *New Covenant in my blood.*" Thus the feast, that began as the Passover, terminated, by a gentle and beautiful transition, in the sweeter and holier solemnity, as the morning brightens into the perfect day. It is impossible, perhaps, to gather out of the Talmuds and the other conflicting Rabbinical authorities, any certain knowledge of the

ritual of the Passover in the time of Christ. But a comparison of the authorities shows that several cups of wine, perhaps three, perhaps five, were drunk during the meal, and served to mark its progress. This circumstance explains the two cups described in Luke xxii: 17-20; the one in verse 17 was, probably, the first Passover cup; and that in verse 20, the third in order, was adopted by the Lord as the sacramental cup. The master of the paschal feast took the unleavened bread and "blessed it," in a prayer of consecration; then he brake it, saying: "*This is the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt.*" According to one tradition, he then took a piece of the broken bread, wrapped it in bitter herbs, and ate it; according to another tradition, he distributed the broken bread among the communicants; the whole showing how close are the analogies of the old and the new sacraments in their respective forms, and even in the words of institution. The cup of wine used at the festival, after the roasted lamb was eaten, was called the cup of benediction, a circumstance which explains, Luke xxii: 20: "Likewise he took the cup *after supper*;" and 1. Cor. x: 16: "The *cup of blessing* which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" The smaller Hallel, or selections from the Psalms of David, was chanted during the feast, and at its close the greater Hallel was sung ending with the grand chorus of Psalm cxxxvi, "O give thanks unto the God of heaven, for his mercy endureth forever." In like manner at the close of the Lord's Supper, "they sang a hymn and went out." These traditions, so far as they are worthy of credit, concur with the statements of the New Testament, in showing that the Lord's Supper was both a supplement, and in the intention of Christ, a substitute for the Passover. His own remarkable explanation of it all was: "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." Matt. xxvi: 29. These words are commonly supposed to describe the fellowship in heaven between Christ and his disciples. But a simpler interpretation refers them to the change then made in the holy ordinances of the church. They taught the disciples that the wine, now that the Kingdom of God was nigh at hand, should from that time forth disappear as the wine of

the Passover, and reappear as the wine of the Lord's table; and that the sacrament itself had, on that memorable night, put off its old and assumed its new and higher form.

Not only the Passover, but several of the Mosaic Institutes, derived their origin from the destruction of the first-born. The Levitical priesthood is one of these. In the primeval period each worshiper offered gifts and sacrifices at his own separate altar, as is indicated in the story of Cain and Abel. Subsequently, the office of priest was in the head or patriarch of the family, as appears from the biography of Noah, Job, Abraham, Melchisedec, and others. During the Egyptian period the ordinance of sacrifice was held in abeyance by the intolerance of the heathen. Ex. viii : 26. At the exodus, God made provision for a sacerdotal order, by setting apart for that purpose all the first-born males of the twelve tribes. The original ordinance is in these words: "Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast; it is mine." Ex. xiii : 2. This ordinance is further explained thus: "All the first-born are mine; for on the day that I smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the first-born in Israel, both man and beast; mine they shall be. I am the LORD." Num. iii : 13. By force of this law the first-born male, both of man and of beast, were divinely reserved for the service of the altar; the former as the priest, the latter as the victim. The fundamental principles of the arrangement were the establishment of a distinct sacerdotal order; the divine selection and vocation of its members; their strictly representative character, and their consanguinity with the people whom they were to represent at the altar.

The designation of the first-born to the office was, however, merely provisional. The germs of some further development of the system were introduced into the original ordinance. In Ex. xiii : 13, a rule is laid down by virtue of which a first-born son a month old might be released from the service. The price of this release was afterward fixed at five shekels. Num. xviii : 16. This process, called the redemption of the first-born, made it certain that some important modification of the plan was contemplated by the Almighty; for he would hardly allow the perpetuity of the priesthood to rest

on the caprices of parents respecting the profession into which their first-born sons should enter. And in point of fact, within six months thereafter the law was amended. By the command of God, at Sinai, Aaron and his sons were set apart to the priesthood; and shortly afterward the males of the whole tribe of Levi, to which Aaron belonged, were chosen for the service of the tabernacle in the place of the first-born of the twelve tribes. The circumstances under which this change was effected are stated in the record. The barbarity of the patriarch Levi, in the slaughter of the Shechemites, described in Genesis xxxiv, induced Jacob, when he was dying, to exclude the tribe of that son from any separate inheritance in Canaan. Gen. xlix: 7. At the exodus, therefore, the descendants of Levi set out for a country, in which, as yet, they had no promise. When, however, the people worshiped the molten calf at Sinai, the disinherited tribe flew to arms at the call of Moses, rallied under the standard of Jehovah, and slew three thousand of the idolaters. In acknowledgment of their piety and patriotism, they were raised to the dignity of the holy tribe. Ex. xxxii: 25-29; Deut. xxxiii: 8-10. According to a census taken at the time, it appeared that there were 22,273 first-born males in the twelve tribes, and 22,000 males, both first-born and after-born, in the tribe of Levi. Jehovah ordered 22,000 of the former to be exchanged for an equivalent number of the latter; and required, moreover, the excess of the first-born in the twelve tribes, that excess being 273, to be redeemed at the rate of five shekels each, the redemption money to be deposited in the treasury of the sanctuary. By this proceeding, Jehovah took the Levites, instead of all the first-born of the children of Israel, for himself. Aaron and his sons, through all generations, held the priesthood, and the Levites in perpetual succession, discharged the inferior offices of the sanctuary. Num. iii: 12-51, viii: 16-18. In the settlement of Canaan, the family of Aaron received neither part nor lot in the land, but the Lord was their inheritance. Num. xviii: 20. To the Levites the tythes of all Israel, together with forty-eight cities, distributed throughout Palestine, were assigned; whereby ample provision was made for their support, and at the same time, the forfeiture announced, two hundred and fifty

years before, in the prophecy of Jacob, was enforced: "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel." Gen. xlix: 7.

Kurtz, and apparently Fairbairn are of the opinion that the elevation of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood had no connection with the sanctification of the first-born described in Ex. xiii. It is doubtless true that the appointment of Aaron antedated by a few days the heroism of the Levites in the punishment of the idolaters; but the language used in Deut. xxxiii: 8-10, shows that the vocation of Aaron was in anticipation of that event. His appointment to the priest's office, and the appointment of his tribe to the inferior duties of the sanctuary, are therefore to be referred to the same historical origin, and that origin is to be traced immediately to the pious zeal of the tribe at Sinai, and remotely to the sanctification of the first-born.

Not only ministers, but victims likewise for the altar, were provided in the passing over of the first-born of Israel. The first-born of cattle as well as of man among the Egyptians were slain; therefore God consecrated to himself the first-born of the cattle belonging to the Israelites. "It is mine," said Jehovah. If it was a male animal of the clean kind, as of oxen, or sheep, or goats, it was to be brought to the altar; Num. xviii: 17; if of the unclean kind, as the foal of an ass, it might be redeemed by a lamb, or its neck broken, at the option of the owner. Ex. xiii: 18. There is but little doubt, moreover, that the ordinances by which God reserved to himself the first fruits of the earth in every kind, took their origin from the same signal deliverance, and were intended to carry out the principles involved in the sanctification of the first-born. Ex. xxii: 29, 30.

The memory of the same event was perpetuated in another provision of the Mosaic institutes—the redemption of the first-born. The arrangement whereby the first-born males of all Israel were exchanged for the entire male population of the tribe of Levi, did not supersede the earlier ordinance which required the first-born, if taken from the special service of God, to be redeemed by money. It became a perpetual law, and through the ages, when the first-born son was a month old, the parents brought five shekels, as redemption money, so called, to the sanctuary. The usage stood in all the genera-

tions of Israel as a monument of the grace of God sparing his people while he smote the Egyptians. "And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shall say unto him, By strength of hand the Lord brought me out from Egypt, from the house of bondage; and it came to pass when Pharaoh would hardly let us go (hardened his heart against our going), that the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man and the first-born of beasts; therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the first-born of my children I redeem." Ex. xiii: 14, 15. This usage associated the events in Egypt with the joy of the parents in receiving their own first-born son; it afforded a steady reverence to the sanctuary, while it was not a burdensome tax, it being levied on a family but once, and at a time, also, when the other expenses of the household were comparatively light. The ordinance was in force down to the end of the dispensation. Christ himself was redeemed by his parents as a part of the righteousness which it became them to fulfill in his person. Luke ii: 23. The idea of redemption and the kindred idea of sanctification pervaded the institutes of Judaism throughout and throughout. From the time of Abraham his posterity held the position of a seed first chosen, then called of God. On the night of the Passover a new principle was introduced, in the notion of redemption, and in the further notion of consecration to the service of God. The first-born of both man and beast were redeemed from death by the blood of the paschal sacrifice; on the same night all Israel was redeemed from bondage, and then the ordinance was promulgated, whereby Jehovah consecrated them all to himself. Afterward Jehovah reserved the first fruits of the earth in all their kinds, as the token that every returning harvest and vintage belonged of right to Him. The incessant repetition, year by year, and age by age, of the redemption of the first-born, and of the oblation of the first fruits carried into every family, and into every harvest-field and vineyard, the conception of a signal redemption and a complete consecration. The order of the proceeding was first the divine choice of the people, and then their vocation, in Abraham; next, centuries afterward, their redemption by

blood and their instantaneous consecration to God; the whole process regulated by a solemn covenant, exhibited in two distinct sacraments, and revealing most distinctly the several stages, one by one, of the election and salvation according to grace. Rom. viii : 29, 30.

Not less clearly is the principle of representation disclosed in all these transactions. According to immemorial custom, the first-born son stood as the representative of the family, clothed with pre-eminence in dignity and power. So sacred was this position that Esau, who sold his birthright, inherited the epithet, "that profane person," as a part of the bargain. Now, the complete rejection of all the families of the Egyptians from the kingdom of God, was set forth in the destruction of their representatives, the first-born sons. When, on the other hand, God spared from death, and then consecrated to himself, all the first-born, both man and beast, among the Hebrews, he proceeded on the same idea of representation, and did in effect set apart the whole people and all their possessions to his service. They are mine, said Jehovah. A similar interpretation is to be put on the statutes requiring the first fruits of the earth to be presented at the door of the tabernacle. Its significance is to be sought, not in the intrinsic value of the sheaf of barley or cluster of grapes, but in the principle conceded in the offering. That principle was of representation again, and it involved the acknowledgment that the whole wealth of the harvest-field, vineyard, olive-yard and fig-orchard were in the first fruits dedicated to God. This idea is exhibited in a still more imposing form in the constitution of the priestly order. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," said Jehovah to Israel. Ex. xix : 6. The Hebrews did not compose the entire church of God, but were the representatives of a church to be gathered out of all nations, even as Aaron and his sons were not all Israel, but were the representatives in holy things of all Israel. Through the priests all the families of Israel were blessed; even so, through Israel, the kingdom of priests, all the families of the earth were to be blessed. Out of this kingdom of priests a special priesthood was created. The entire sacerdotal commonwealth was represented by the tribe of Levi; this tribe by the priestly family of Aaron; and

the family of priests by Aaron, the High Priest, and his successors lawfully coming into office. In the High Priest every sacred function belonging to the whole priestly order, to the tribe of Levi, to the whole kingdom of priests, to all the elect of God, reached its earthly consummation. In him all were recapitulated. He bore the names of the twelve tribes on the shoulders of his ephod and on his jeweled breast-plate. More than this, the wonderful law of imputation, by virtue of which the High Priest was required to "bear the iniquity" of the whole congregation, was now revealed and laid upon both priest and people, binding them together. On the great day of atonement he offered up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; and for them also, he ventured, though never without blood, to enter the Holy of Holies. The manner in which these ideas of representation, imputation, and atonement are in the Gospel carried over into the work of the Lord Jesus is most clearly set forth in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Israel left Egypt laden with the spoils of war. When God announced to Abraham the future enslavement of the chosen seed, he added this promise: "That nation whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterward they shall come out with great substance." Gen. xv: 14. The literal fulfillment of this engagement was a necessity, not only of the faithfulness of God, but of the supreme dignity of the occasion, and of the issues involved in the exodus. Nothing could have been more inappropriate as a conclusion of the wonders wrought in Egypt, nothing more unsuitable to the character of the God of Israel, than the escape of the Hebrews after the manner of an immense gang of fugitive slaves, a ragged, starving rabble of mendicants. They were not lazzaroni; they were not a mob of routed and panic-struck Arabs; they were the heirs of the covenant, a redeemed church, God's own son, even his first-born. A future of consummate glory was before them. Prophets, kings, and priests, together with the Lord Jesus, in whom the illustrious offices held by them all, were to obtain their consummate expression, were borne in their loins, and the whole company of the elect was represented in their assembly. Their departure from Egypt was in keeping with their position and destiny. "They went out with

a high hand" (openly, boldly), "in the sight of the Egyptians." Num. xxxiii: 3. More than this, "they went up harnessed," armed, or equipped for battle. Ex. xiii: 18. Not only so, but they clothed their sons and daughters with the best spoils of war, even "jewels of silver and jewels of gold and raiment." Ex. iii: 20-22. They marched out of Egypt in magnificent array, a victorious, not a retreating, army—a festal procession compassed about with songs of deliverance.

The value of the treasures taken from the Egyptians may be estimated from the contributions subsequently made by the Hebrews, first to the support of idolatry and then to the service of God. The calf worshiped at Sinai was molten out of the golden ear-rings worn by the people. The amount of precious metals used in the preparation of the tabernacle and its furniture was almost incalculable. For reasons which are obvious to those who have reflected upon the ignorance, degradation, idolatry, and polytheism of both the Hebrews and the heathen, it was needful that the sanctuary and priesthood should be clothed with a transcendent outward splendor. The tabernacle itself was necessarily diminutive in size, in order that it might be taken down and borne about like a tent, from place to place. It was only thirty feet long, ten wide, and fifteen high; not so large as the parlor in many modern dwelling houses. What was wanting, therefore, in a lofty and imposing architecture, was supplied by the magnificence of its decorations. It could not be invested with the grandeur of the cathedral, but it might wear the beauty of a gem; and so address through their senses and captivate the hearts of a rude and sensuous race. The spoils which the Hebrews brought out of Egypt, together with their own proper wealth, supplied the materials for the structure. At the call of Moses the men and women brought "holy garments, and bracelets, and ear-rings, and rings, and tablets, all jewels of gold;" "and every man with whom was found blue and purple, and scarlet and fine linen, and goats' hair, and red-skins of rams, and badgers' skins, brought them"—together with "silver and brass." Ex. xxxv: 21-24. The profusion with which these treasures were lavished upon the building and its appointments, is fully set forth in the twenty-fifth and thirty-seventh chapters of Exodus. The foundation was of silver, the walls

were plated without, and coupled together with gold; the crown of the altar of incense, and of the table of shew-bread, and their bowls and rings, were of gold. The mercy seat and the overshadowing cherubim, were of beaten gold. The candlestick, together with its seven branches, was made of "gold, pure and beaten," of a talent, or ninety pounds in weight. The amount of the precious metals used about the edifice was twenty-nine talents and seven hundred and thirty shekels of gold, and a hundred talents and seventeen hundred and seventy-five shekels of silver. Ex. xxxviii: 24, 25. Arbuthnot, whose tables of ancient weights and measures are relied on in England as accurate, estimates the shekel of silver at fifty cents, the talent of silver at \$1,505.62, the golden shekel at \$8.63, and the golden talent at \$24,309. Upon this computation the aggregate of both metals, used upon the building and its furniture, reached nearly a million of dollars. Eisenschmidius reduces the estimate to \$800,000, and Michaelis to about \$315,000. Böckh, a distinguished German scholar, has recently investigated the subject anew; and his unwearied industry in collecting and sifting all the knowledge pertaining to the subject, in the possession of mankind, has given to his treatise the authority of a standard. He reduces the estimate of Arbuthnot by about eight per cent. only. To this are to be added the embroidered curtains of the tabernacle, the rare and costly jewels set in the breast-plate of the high priest, the brilliants worn on his shoulders, and the munificent gifts in gold and silver plate offered by the twelve princes at the dedication. Still another element, though of uncertain significance, must enter into the calculation; the relative value, to wit, of the precious metals in the days of Moses and at the present time. These values are perpetually changing from month to month; but it is an opinion universally received, that they have depreciated many fold, as the supply has increased, during the progress of ages. Dr. Jahn states that their value in the fourth century before Christ, was to their value in England in A. D. 1780 as ten to one. The ratio, in the problem, between the sixteenth century before Christ and the present time can not be less; in point of fact it must be greater. If now the estimate of only one million and a quarter of dollars be put on the treasures at the tabernacle; and if, furthermore, that esti-

mate be increased by a moderate formula representing the depreciation of the precious metals during the run of thirty-five centuries, the sum total must be reckoned by many millions. The whole narrative exhibits at once the wealth and luxury of Egypt, the immeasurable value of the spoils taken thence by the Hebrews, and the sacred purposes to which these spoils were applied. Indeed, the tabernacle stood for five hundred years, first in the wilderness, then in Canaan, a memorial of the night in which the fathers came out of Egypt "with great substance."

The means by which the Hebrews obtained possession of these immense treasures are commonly supposed to present one of the difficult problems of biblical history. According to the English version, the Hebrews "borrowed" and the Egyptians "lent" the jewels. The question of morals involved in the transaction, so far as the Israelites alone were concerned, might be summarily dismissed. For, the charge of fraud might be left, without much compunction, at the door of a generation whose carcasses, for their disobedience, fell in the wilderness. But the record states, in terms, that Moses directed the people to borrow the jewels, and, furthermore, that he gave this order in obedience to the divine command. In Gen. xv: 14, God made promise to Abraham that his seed should come out of Egypt with great substance. In Ex. iii: 20-22, the promise assumes a specific form: "when ye go, ye shall not go empty; but every woman shall borrow of her neighbor, and of her that sojourneth in her house, jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment: and ye shall put them upon your sons, and upon your daughters: and ye shall spoil the Egyptians." In Ex. xi: 1-3, it appears as a divine command. Jehovah said to Moses: "Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbor," etc. Once more, in xii: 35, 36, the original promise and the subsequent command are carried over into action by the Hebrews, who borrowed, and the Egyptians, who lent, the jewels. The case as here made, is supposed by the skeptics to leave the inspiration of the Pentateuch, the integrity of Moses and the character of God himself in a predicament which calls, not for defense—that is pronounced impossible—but for suitable apologies. Those who have undertaken the defense have, until

recently, proceeded on the assumption, accepted so readily by the skeptic, that the transaction was, in the real nature of it, an act of borrowing and lending. They have dealt with the problem, as so stated, after various methods.

The traditional solution is found in the doctrine of divine sovereignty. Calvin says: "There is no need of weighing the judgment of God by ordinary rules, since we have already seen that all the possessions of the world are his, to distribute them according to his pleasure." It is undoubtedly true that God is the sovereign proprietor of all things; and may, of perfect right, transfer earthly possessions from one to another. But this explanation overlooks the main difficulty, to wit: the fraud by which the transfer was effected. For the same reason Pfeiffer's defense is insufficient, which is to the effect that the Israelites borrowed the property with the intention of returning it, but were afterward directed by the Almighty to retain it as their own. Nor are these explanations strengthened by the remark of Augustine, which is that the command was such as ought to be obeyed, not canvassed. To this the reply must be, that the command appears to involve the rectitude of God, and the foundation of the higher command: "Be ye holy, for I am holy." Nor do those solve the difficulty who hold that God has a right to suspend the laws which regulate ownership in property, because the real question at issue here is of the law of eternal and immutable morality.

Other solutions have been found in the peculiar relations existing between the parties. Tertullian and Grotius resort to the doctrine of reprisals, under which, as they contend, the Hebrews were justifiable in repaying themselves, as best they could, for their unrequited labors in Egypt. But it is obvious that they were not at liberty to seek relief, even if they were fully entitled to it, by an act of fraud and falsehood. If a man be robbed he may not rob back. *Justi* rests the propriety of the proceeding on the supposition that the Hebrews left behind them houses, lands, and other fixed property of great value, in exchange for the treasures which they took away. But, according to the statement of the case, it was a matter of borrowing and lending, not of bargain and sale. Besides this, the women "borrowed jewels of their neighbors;" how

were the lenders, without failure or exception, to get possession of the property left by the Israelites?

A third mode of explanation proceeds from the bad faith chargeable on the Egyptians. Michaelis is of opinion that the Hebrews borrowed the treasures for use at the festival in the wilderness; that they expected to return to Egypt; but the pursuit, which Pharaoh set on foot, in violation of his agreement, released them from all obligation, either to go back themselves, or to return the property. To this the reply may well be, that the Israelites did not expect to go back, else why did they carry with them the bones of Joseph for burial in Canaan? Nor did Pharaoh expect them to return; for, if so, why did he pursue them? A modification of this line of defense is that the Hebrews became an independent nation at the exodus; the Egyptians wantonly made war on them; and, therefore, the Hebrews, by virtue of their rights as belligerents, were absolved from their obligations as borrowers. This explanation is tenable only by those who say with them of old time, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy;" that among the rights of belligerents is exemption from the inward sense of both honor and shame; and that a merchant may, in time of war, repudiate debts contracted with the private citizens of the adverse state in time of peace. Historical justice will hardly impute such knavery to the Hebrews, recreant as they were; and to charge the Almighty with conniving at such practices, is a kind of Atheism.

The true determination of the question is to be recognized in the meaning of the Hebrew words, incorrectly translated by "borrowed" and "lent," in the common version. The words are *Shahal*, in the Kal conjugation, and *Hishael*, in the Hiphil or cause-form of the same verb; and they should be rendered by *asking* and *giving*. The proof of this statement is ample. The word *Shahal* occurs one hundred and seventy-one times in the Hebrew Scriptures. Its ordinary use may be seen in such places as these: "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance." Psalms ii: 8. "Now, then, behold the king whom ye have *desired*." 1 Sam. xii: 13. "And God said to him (Solomon) because thou hast *asked* this thing, and hast not *asked* for thyself long life, neither hast *asked* riches for thyself, nor hast *asked* the life of thine enemies;

but hast *asked* for thyself understanding," etc. 1 Kings iii: 11. The absurdity of rendering the word by borrow in these places, is sufficiently glaring. There is but one place, besides Ex. xii: 35, 36, in which *Shahal* occurs in both Kal and Hiphil. Hannah said of her son Samuel, "The Lord hath given me my petition which I have *asked* (*Kal*) of him, therefore, also, I have *lent* (*Hiphil*) him to the Lord; as long as he liveth he shall be *lent* to the Lord." 1 Sam. i: 27, 28. The word is here also improperly translated; because the act of Hannah was in no sense a lending, but an unconditional consecration of her son to the service of God. Finally, there are but two instances, out of the one hundred and seventy-one, in which *Shahal* is correctly rendered to borrow. "If a man shall *borrow* aught of his neighbor," etc. Ex. xxii: 14. "Alas! Master, for it was *borrowed*." 2 K. vi: 5. In these places, the word takes a very unusual meaning, in obedience to the inexorable law of the sentence-form.

If the question arise as to the inducements leading the Egyptians to part voluntarily with the jewels at the request of the Hebrews, the answer will be complete. First, "the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent (gave) unto them such things as they required." Ex. xii: 36. Comp. Ex. iii: 21. Next, "the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people;" which is assigned as a leading motive with the Egyptians in the transaction, at Ex. xi: 3. Further, the asking and giving took place on the night of the destruction of the first-born. The terrified and wailing Egyptians rose up in a body, and, in a manner, drove away the Israelites. They "were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men." xii: 33. Their cry would very naturally be: "Begone, quickly; take bracelets and rings, and tablets of gold; take raiment; take what you will; take all, and go at once; we are all dead." Thus the people "spoiled the Egyptians." They went forth, not as borrowers, abusing the credulity of their enemies, but conquerors, laden with the trophies of war.

If a further question arise as to the origin of the mistranslation, the answer may be given in a few words. It was first

admitted into the Septuagint, thence it passed into the Latin version of Jerome, and was adopted by the Vulgate. The Latin fathers, the theologians of the middle ages, and the divines of the Reformation, were, for the most part, ignorant of the Hebrew tongue. They received as correct the traditional reading contained in the Vulgate; and having thereby surrendered the question to all the hazards entailed upon it by the mischievous blunder, they were left to deal with the terms borrowing and lending, as best they could. It is only since the church began to appeal to the Hebrew text, which "was immediately inspired of God," that the matter has been put into its proper light.

In order to complete this study it will be necessary to consider some of the difficulties which are supposed to beset the narrative of the exodus. These difficulties, long since solved by biblical scholars, had passed out of sight until they were reproduced by Bishop Colenso, in his recent attack on the Pentateuch. He finds a stumbling stone, for example, in the institution of the Passover. He assumes that the Hebrew population of 2,000,000 were distributed over a territory as large as the English county of Hertfordshire. He then alleges that, according to the record, the Hebrews received only a twelve hours' previous notice of the destruction of the first-born. Between sunset and sunrise, therefore, the complicated ordinance of the Passover was made known and fully explained to a population as large as that of London; a hundred and fifty thousand paschal lambs were procured, killed, and roasted; the jewels all borrowed; the cattle, estimated at two millions in number, were collected; the movable property of the Hebrews packed up, and all things put in readiness for the march. Such, the Bishop declares, is the substance of the narration. To this the answer is, first, that according to Ex. xii: 3, the people had at least four days' instead of twelve hours' notice; for they were directed to select the paschal lamb on the tenth day of the month, and to kill it on the fourteenth. More than this, they had sixty days' notice, because the nine plagues had extended through that period; these were declared by Jehovah himself to be wrought for the immediate emancipation of the people, and they were attended by constant negotiations unto that end

between Pharaoh and Moses. And, more yet, there is a sound sense in which the Hebrews received notice, running through four hundred years, in the promise to Abraham. Gen. xv: 18, 14. Finally, the cavil hangs upon the brittle thread of a blunder of the Bishop's own, in the interpretation of Ex. xii: 12: "for I will pass through the land of Egypt this night," etc. He insists that the pronoun "this" designates the very day on which Jehovah was giving directions to Moses as to the Passover, whereas it evidently points to the "fourteenth day of the month" in verse 6; just as one might now say, "on the fourth day of July, 1876, on *this* very day, the first century of the independence of America will be completed." Indeed, the same Hebrew pronoun occurs in Gen. vii: 11, and is well translated, in our version, "on the *same* day."

Again, in Ex. xiii: 18, it is written, "The children of Israel went up harnessed (armed) out of the land of Egypt." Colenso asks whence 600,000 men obtained arms, and why was the immense host, if well armed, "sore afraid" when pursued by Pharaoh? Ex. xiv: 10. To the first question the reply may be that the weapons of war, at that time in use, were of the simplest and cheapest kinds, as slings, bows, and javelins, and, therefore, easily obtained; and, besides, in popular language, the people of a country are said to be in arms, although only a certain portion are actually equipped. To the second question the answer is, that long servitude had exhausted the courage of the Hebrews; and even brave men might be alarmed at the prospect of a battle if their wives and children, their aged and infirm, were all with them in the camp, having the deep sea in the rear.

The Bishop urges, very strongly, the statistical difficulty exhibited in the exchange of the first-born sons of all Israel for the males of the tribe of Levi. The number of males among the Hebrews is estimated at one million, of whom, as it is stated, 22,273 were first-borns, giving, apparently, about forty-four sons to each family. Num. iii: 43. This problem is solved, first, by the form of the expression in Num. iii: 12, "all the first-born that *openeth* the matrix," which indicates that when the oldest child was a daughter, any son born afterward was not reckoned as a "first-born;" reducing the ratio one-half. Secondly, the first-born sons, who had families of

their own, would not, it is fair to presume, be counted, but their first-born sons only, or youth under sixteen or eighteen years of age, being about one-third of the whole. This diminishes the ratio to one-sixth, or an average of seven and a third sons to a family. Thirdly, polygamy prevailed to an unusual extent among the Hebrews. 1 Chron. vii: 4. In families where there was more than one mother, the first-born son of the first wife only was, probably, counted. Jacob had four sets of sons, but Reuben alone was acknowledged as the first-born. Gen. xlix: 3. This reduces the ratio still lower. If it be also remembered, fourthly, that the Hebrew women were, at this time, remarkably prolific, the difficulty is fully determined.

The other exceptions taken by Colenso to the historical credibility of the Pentateuch do not fall within the range of this paper. But their validity may be judged by the weight of those which have now been looked into. The author is said to have commenced his public labors by publishing an arithmetic. It is to be hoped that he stated his examples with more accuracy in his "rule of three," than in his specimen of arithmetical theology. In this, certainly, he has not only exposed his mathematics to derision, but his theology also to the stinging aphorism cited by one of his critics, out of Suetonius: "*Negligenter circa Deos, quippe addictus mathematicæ.*"

ART. II.—*The Element of Admonition in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

WE are liable to lose much of the instruction which the Scriptures might yield us from our faulty methods of reading them. We commonly read them, a chapter here and a chapter there; or, even if we read a whole book in course, yet we take only two or three chapters at a time.

Now, the division of the Scripture writings into chapters, while very convenient for reference, is yet often, as is well known, very arbitrary, so far as the meaning is concerned.

Portions closely connected in sense are often separated into different chapters. It is very difficult, on this account, to read a book of Scripture, a chapter or two at a time, and yet so preserve in our minds the connection of the parts as to receive a proper impression of the whole. The Epistles of Paul are usually very closely connected in sense throughout; as much so as the ablest argument of an advocate or the best considered opinion of a judge. If we take the advocate's printed argument or the judge's opinion, and divide it into a dozen equal portions, and then read one or two portions to-day, and one or two to-morrow, here and there, we shall see how unsatisfactory is the process for ascertaining the full merits of the paper.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is a closely-connected writing, and it needs not only to be studied in its separate parts, but sometimes to be read through at a sitting. The element of teaching in this Epistle, referred to as the theme of this article, is all the more significant and impressive, from its being found to pervade the writing and to constitute one of its essential features; but this we should hardly perceive or feel, unless upon a view of the book as a whole.

A glance through this book reveals its main drift. It is an argument, addressed to Jews, and intended to convince them of the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. The book opens with a statement and proof of Christ's supreme divinity; it then vindicates from objection the concurrent truth of Christ's humanity; it next shows the superiority of Christ over Moses, the founder of the Jewish polity; it further exhibits his superiority as a Priest over the Levitical priesthood; and then, at much length, it argues the temporary and merely typical character of the Mosaic institutions, and the reality and perfection and enduring nature of the Christian economy, thus establishing the position that the very setting-up of the Christian dispensation does of necessity abolish the Jewish rites—they vanish away, as the morning star disappears in the light of the rising sun.

Such is the main drift of the book. And as an argument addressed to Jews, we can not but greatly admire it, when we search into its deepest meanings and follow it step by step. So thoroughly does it review the whole field of Jewish worship, so

fully does it ascertain and reveal the true nature of the Jewish institutions, so satisfactorily does it dispose of Jewish objections to Christianity, and show that Christianity, in its every feature, is indeed the exact and glorious thing which Judaism itself, as symbolic of it, would have it to be, we are brought to a new and more delighted admiration of the book whenever we freshly examine it. And not only so; not only as a book addressed to Jews do we admire it, but we are ourselves instructed by it; we are instructed in the true nature of the religion of the Bible, whether as depicted in the shadowy representations of Old Testament rites, or as plainly revealed in the doctrine here unfolded concerning Christ's person and work. This book sheds a flood of light on the older Scriptures, while it further teaches, with a fullness and impressiveness nowhere else to be found, the great truth of Christ's divine and priestly mediation. Thus, in its main drift, it is of direct and permanent and universal interest.

Yet we would now call particular attention to the fact, that underneath this main drift of the book, there is another teaching, and one of scarcely less interest or importance. It is a teaching much less observed, and indeed very seldom observed at all, as a pervading element of the Epistle. But there it is, recurring to distinct view, again and again, from the beginning to the end of the book. Step by step, the apostle proceeds with his high argument for the superiority of the Christian dispensation, unfolding its glories and demonstrating its absolute and final character; yet at each step he pauses and interposes words of solemn warning. He drops for a time the argument, and addresses his readers with most earnest admonition. Thus, in the first chapter, we have the argument for our Saviour's supreme divinity. He is the Son of God, the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person, the maker of the worlds and the almighty upholder of all things, whom all angels are commanded to worship, whom the Father calls God and accounts as equal with himself. But with the beginning of the second chapter it is no longer argument—it is admonition: "Therefore, we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every trans-

gression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward,"—if this was so under the old economy—"how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken," not by angels, but "by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." The superiority of Christianity over Judaism is thus made the ground of a solemn warning against neglecting its claims.

Looking on in the third chapter, we see that, after Christ's superiority to Moses is demonstrated, the argument again pauses and the admonition is resumed, continuing far into the next chapter: "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." Take heed lest, under temptation, you reject Christ, as the Hebrews of old rejected Moses, forfeiting God's favor and perishing in the wilderness. In your case, both the danger and the guilt of unbelief are greater than in theirs.

Looking on again into the fifth and sixth chapters, we see that, after Christ's superiority over the Aaronic priesthood is exhibited, there is another pause and a yet more solemn warning. The language is, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

Advancing still further, through the seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters into the tenth, we find that close upon the long argument here furnished for the superiority of the Christian economy, comes the renewed admonition corresponding with the argument, "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace?"

And once again, glancing through the eleventh into the twelfth chapter, we do not fail to find that, after many incitements and encouragements are given to lead a religious life according to the gospel, the admonition is again resumed: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words;"—these circumstances, under which the law was given at Sinai, were truly terrible, but they were by no means so grandly solemn as those which gather about the gospel, and into the midst of which you are brought. "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel." Ye have come to all these in the gospel. These are the things which the gospel familiarly reveals, about which it is constantly employed, and into close connection with which it brings its believers—things of heaven and earth, of God and man, of eternity and time—things infinitely more sublime than the mere tokens of Jehovah's presence, on the top of one of earth's mountains. The admonition implied in this statement is then explicitly given: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him which speaketh from heaven."

Thus, looking through this Epistle, we perceive that the warning first sounded near its beginning, recurs at intervals to the end of the writing. We see that admonition is a pervading element of the Epistle. This may be called its solemn *undertone*, not at once perceived by the casual listener, but becoming perceptible upon our attentive listening, and sounding all the more distinctly and impressively in proportion as we heed it. This is the deep, *rhythmic bass* in the grand harmony of the Epistle, making its music awful in impression.

Let us go to the sea-side. Standing there alone, let us

yield ourselves to the influence of our position. Let us listen to the music of the sea, "those hollow tunes it plays against the land," and soon that music will analyze itself to our ears. First, beneath the sound of the wind, which comes moaning and sighing from afar, will be heard the shrill crackling of the water, as the broken waves, in their last motion landward, send their contents rolling and spreading along the hard sandy beach. This is the *treble* of the music. Then, presently, beneath this, will be heard a lower tone, the sound of washing, washing, as the waters in ten thousand broken parts roll over each other, or roll back upon each other from the land. It is the *tenor* of the preceding *treble*. Then, beneath all else, will be perceived still another part, giving grandeur to this music. The great body of ocean's waters, roused into motion by mighty storms far out at sea, sends mountain billows landward in chasing flight. Onward they go, all unobstructed, till suddenly a continent unmasks its front, at once to meet and to annihilate them. And it is the sudden and expiring voice of these monster billows, massing themselves against the shore and rending into fragments, whose concurrent groans create the thunder of the sea. There is thus a solemn *bass*, a grand *undertone*, in the harmony of the music of the sea.

Or, let us visit Niagara, and learn the wonders which the Falls possess, as well for the ear as for the eye. Listening, that deafening roar will soon become the music of the cataract. There is no *treble* here, but there is the same sound of washing, washing, as the superficial waters glide over those beneath them; then there is a deeper sound, as the great body of waters tear themselves from the river's bed, and over the rocky edge of the precipice rush to their doom; and then, once more, beneath all, and down, as if about earth's foundations, where the solid rocks meet the descending mass of ponderous waters and cast them back, *there* is Niagara's voice of solemn *bass*, her *undertone*, giving grandeur to her music.

Ah! that *undertone*, in every sublime anthem, played or sung by Nature's many instruments and voices, or by human hands and lips, it may be the part last distinctly recognized, yet when recognized it is the last to be lost from hearing.

There it is evermore, and we hear it sounding on, giving foundation and law and life to all the parts and voices that roll and swell above it.

And conceiving of the divine writing under consideration as an anthem of God's truth, sounded forth for man's salvation, and an anthem of many voices, its undertone of recurrent, solemn warning, seems no less grand, and no less vital to the full force of the music. It is a blessed and majestic truth that our Saviour is the Son of God, clothed with all adorable perfections; and let that truth be proclaimed in song as a *melody* of music worthy of angelic lips. But if the Saviour be thus exalted, what dignity must attach itself to his work. How absolutely necessary must be his work in order to man's salvation, and what a glorious salvation must that be which his work provides, and how great must be the grace which prompted him to provide it—even by the tremendous sacrifice of himself, and then what loss and what guilt must be incurred by those who neglect or despise this salvation. And thus begins the undertone of this music. "O, what great salvation," sounds the delightful melody, "provided by the only and the beloved Son of God!" And the undertone is heard, deeply rolling its words of warning, "Ah, how shall we escape, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" And so continues the heavenly melody through this sacred writing; of Christ our merciful High Priest, able to succor every tempted soul; of Christ our Eternal High Priest, able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him; of the new and living way opened into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus, through which we draw nigh to God; of a complete and glorious salvation for every humble soul, desiring and trusting in Jesus: thus sings the heavenly melody. Yet, at the same time, and all along, is heard the undertone, sounding louder as it sounds longer, proclaiming the truth that the greatness of God's grace lays man under increased weight of obligation, and that the rejection of his grace calls for a vengeance as sore as the grace is wonderful, and exhorting that we refuse not him that speaketh.

And is it not, we ask, this underlying truth that chiefly makes impressive the truth above it? Is it not the alternate truth which gives evident and deep significance to the princi-

pal truth? Is it not the dark background which brings into light the figures on the foreground? We might revere and extol, with delighted heart, the blessed truth of God's tender compassion, of his forgiving mercy, of his long-suffering kindness, not willing that any should perish; but is it not when we see this truth in contrast with his awful holiness, his strict and eternal justice, his solemn purpose by no means to clear the guilty—is it not *then* that the former truth takes it firmest and fullest possession of our souls? And is it not when, in this Epistle, we see the God of our salvation, in all the glory of his adorable mercies, pouring out the treasures of his heart for our blessing, and longing for our salvation, and yet, at the same moment, hear this declaration, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," and this, "For our God is a consuming fire"—is it not, *then*, that our souls become burdened with the truth of God's compassions? Is it not the undertone of warning, sounding its low thunder, that profoundly moves our souls with its reverberations?

No doubt the peculiar element of teaching in this Epistle referred to, had a special significance for those Jews, or Jewish Christians, to whom the Epistle was at first addressed. They had heard the gospel preached, and many of them had professedly embraced it; yet they were tempted to renounce their profession, or, if they had not professed Christ, they were tempted to disclaim any interest which they had once felt in the Christian religion. They were tempted to return to Judaism and rest there. That was a religion which, on many accounts, pleased them better than Christianity. So, while the writer of this Epistle endeavors to convince them that the Christian religion is true, that it is the reality of which Judaism was but the shadow, and that it is the only true religion; and while, arraying his matchless arguments for this end, he, at the same time and by the same act, exhibits with wonderful fulness and force the great truths of the gospel; he also interposes the warnings here found, because those exact warnings were specially needed by the persons to whom he wrote, and because the truths which he had exhibited were exactly adapted to enforce such warnings. In their careless preference of Judaism over Christianity, they did not

see how great a salvation that is which the gospel provides; and hence, when the apostle exhibits its greatness as seen in the dignity of Christ's person, he also warns them, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" So again, the apostle declares that by rejecting Christianity and going back to Judaism, they would re-enact the tragedy of Christ's crucifixion. They would approve the murderous act of their countrymen, who thus declared, "We will not have this man to reign over us." And thus deliberately rejecting Christianity, after they had been enlightened to know its real character, thus crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh and putting him to an open shame, it would be out of the question for them ever to be saved. Such apostasy would be final and hopeless. So, still further, the apostle shows that as the Old Testament rites had been done away by the sacrifice of Christ, and no longer had any force, those who went back from Christianity to Judaism renounced a reality for a nothing; rejecting the sacrifice of Christ, which was a real atonement, and which turned away the wrath of God, there was for them no sacrifice whatever, there was nothing to come between them and the wrath of God, so that "there remained" only "a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation which should devour the adversaries;" and they were warned that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Thus these admonitions had a special adaptation to those who were tempted to renounce Christianity for Judaism.

Yet this special adaptation relates to the *form*, rather than to the *substance* of these warnings. As the principal teachings of this Epistle concerning the person and work of Christ are of universal and perpetual interest, so the warnings which answer to these teachings have a full application wherever men, for any reasons whatever, are disposed to neglect or reject the gospel. And knowing how prone men are to prefer religions of their own to that of the Bible, knowing how ready they often are to go back from the doctrine of Christ the Son of God sacrificed for our sins, and faith in him as the only way of salvation, and to take up the idea of God's general mercy, or of man's goodness, or of the merit of human penances and sacrifices, or of what not?—knowing

this, it is no doubt the duty of the minister of the word frequently to repeat these same warnings, and to urge them as Paul did, by the consideration of the great and gracious things of the gospel. It is the duty of every Christian minister to make these warnings the undertone of all his preaching, even as Paul did of all this Epistle.

The truth needs perpetually to be brought before the minds of all who hear the gospel, that just in proportion to the magnitude of God's mercies to us in Christ Jesus, is the guilt of our neglect, or unbelief, or apostacy. If God had done little or nothing for human salvation, then the guilt had been less which refused his proposals. If men thought they saw better grounds of hope elsewhere, and hence looked elsewhere, it would not have been quite so strange, or sad, or wicked. But how stands the matter in regard to the religion of Christ? How intense the interest which God evinces in this religion! This seems to have the very highest place in his heart. It is not, apparently, so much the happiness of the angelic world, and the worship which angelic hosts continually offer, that engages and delights him, as it is the salvation of perishing men, and the worship of the penitent and broken-hearted of earth.

We look to God's word, and we see that God is everywhere interested there. How clearly he reveals, how fully he explains, how urgently he remonstrates, how tenderly he persuades, plying men at every point with the most powerful motives. There is nowhere in the world a book so much in earnest as the Bible; and all its earnestness has direct relation to the matter of man's salvation. This end—this—by every holy or innocent means, God would compass.

We look further, and we learn the same lesson in seeing what God has actually done for men in his gospel; at what a sacrifice on his part the foundations of human pardon are laid, and the channel for his saving mercy is opened. The declaration may have a familiar sound, but we do not know its full meaning, and we never shall, though we ponder it to eternity, that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." Here were all gifts which even God could bestow, summed up in one. God had but

one Son, and he did not give him for angels, but sacrificed him for men. In the one gift and sacrifice he poured out all the treasures of his merciful heart, and expended for our salvation all that even God could possibly give, for any object or for all objects combined.

And if this is not enough to illustrate the urgency of the claims of religion, we may look further to the Son of God, and see him coming forth from the Father and veiling himself in flesh, and wearing out and giving up his life in bearing our sins and carrying our sorrows; we may see him as the ever-living Priest of his people, perpetually interceding for them in heaven; we may see him exalted to be head over all things unto his church, and as king over the universe, ordering all things for the progress of his cause, and satisfied only when he sees of the travail of his soul in the justification of many.

And if this is not enough, we may still further look to the Holy Spirit of God, and see him descending from heaven and dwelling in our world of sin; see him engaged continually in his work of moving upon the hearts of men to bring them to the Saviour,—enlightening their darkness, humbling their pride, renewing their wills, strengthening their weakness, striving unweariedly in them against sin, and helping them on to God.

And if even all this is not enough, we may consider still further that complicated apparatus which God has instituted and set in motion for extending and perpetuating his religion. What mean our sabbaths, our sanctuaries, the living ministry, the circulating Bible, the sacraments, the company of God's people—and all these in constant and full employment—what mean they all, if God is not intent upon the salvation of men through the gospel of his Son?

And the question comes, can it be that what thus lies so near the heart of God, and thus employs so fully the energies of God, and thus involves so largely the glory of God,—can it be that this is a matter which men may innocently disregard, or lightly let go for rival interests and claims? Or, rather, do we not perceive again and more clearly, that all the stupendous truths of our religion unite and sing, even on

that undertone which sounds the warnings of the Epistle before us?

God is in earnest in the matter of his religion; how great is the corresponding earnestness which is claimed from men! God has provided and offered a glorious salvation; what zealous seeking and thankful acceptance should it everywhere induce! Those who are habitually indifferent to the religion of the Bible, and treat its claims as of trivial moment, or who frame for themselves religious opinions, or adopt those furnished by others, disliking the religion of the Bible,—such should learn the great lesson of this Epistle; that there is for them no religion save that of the Bible. There is one God, there is one Bible, and there is one religion. There is nowhere to be found a single promise of God made to men apart from the Bible; there is nowhere to be found a single promise of the Bible made to men apart from Christ; Christ has laid the foundation for promise only as the Divine Son of God, by the sacrifice of himself; and the Son of God, given as our Saviour, was the one gift which exhausted the treasury of Heaven. And that this great lesson of the Epistle may have its due impression, the corresponding admonitions of the Epistle must be regarded;—that, apart from this only religion, men can have no hope before God; that, neglecting this great salvation, they can not possibly escape the just reward of their transgressions; that, rejecting the sacrifice which Christ has offered for sin, no atonement is left, and there “remains” only the fearful anticipation of God’s judgment and fiery indignation. This undertone of the music of the gospel men everywhere need to hear, until its resounding thunder fills their souls with salutary dread. While mercy everywhere invites, warning should everywhere urge men to salvation—escaping for their lives, looking not behind them, neither staying in all the plain, escaping to the mountain, lest they be consumed.

ART. III.—*The Peril and Duty of the American People, with Respect to the Foreign Relations of the Country, impending War with England and France, and the threatened Humiliation and Partition of the United States.*

TO ALL human observation there is one effectual way, and there is but one, to suppress the rebellion, extinguish the civil war, and restore the country to its former condition. That way is to break, scatter, crush the military power of the Confederate Rebel States, to such a degree that all armed and organized resistance, on their part, will cease. The reason why there is no other way, is simply because the dominant class of rebels in arms will accept of no terms of peace which the American people are willing to grant them; and having sedulously contrived an issue which could naturally result only in their own conquest, or the destruction of the American nation, as it then existed—they have, during two years of frightful war, continually put it more and more out of the power of the mass of the Southern people to force the military despotism, under which they groan, to change that issue. Whatever may have been the wishes of those people, or whatever those wishes may be now, or hereafter, they have no power, no means, of making them known, except through that military despotism, whose destruction, by arms, it is the highest duty of the American people to accomplish.

We do not propose, at this time, to discuss the consequences which would follow the effectual breaking of the military power of the armed rebels. The great result designed by the American people, is the restoration of the Federal Union, and the preservation of the national life and institutions, just as they all were before—or as nigh to that as the uncontrollable circumstances which may then exist, will allow. Nor do we mean to say that the suppression of the rebellion, and the extinction of the civil war by conquest, are conditions precedent to the possibility of peace; for it is too obvious that perils are gathering over the country, both from within and from without—which, unless met with the greatest wisdom and vigor, may make an infamous peace seal, at once, our ruin and our disgrace. But what we mean to say is, that no peace

by which the country can be restored to its former condition is possible, except by means of the military suppression of the rebellion, and the thorough conquest by arms of the rebel forces. We wish, with all our heart, that it were otherwise. We deplore, as we have never deplored any public event, the necessity laid upon the American people, in this behalf. But it is as clear to us, as it ever was, that if any duty ever was incumbent upon any nation or any generation of men, that it is our duty, God helping us, to preserve the life, the integrity, and the institutions of this great nation—and to that end to do all that righteous men, who expect to give account to God, may undertake. Nay, further—we are firmly persuaded that if, by the folly and wickedness of men, and by the inscrutable providence of God, we are not permitted to accomplish, in its obvious way, the great duty set before us; we are bound so to shape events that we shall reap the most signal equivalents for our failure, and that they who interfere to hinder us shall pay a price for their perfidy, which they will long remember, and for which coming ages will bless us.

Considering the relative condition of the parties, and the actual state of the war, there are, apparently, but three ways in which it is possible for the American people to be prevented from accomplishing the work set before them. It is, no doubt, possible that we might fail through the incompetence of those into whose hands the doing of the great work has fallen. We might also fail through the indifference of a great portion of the American people to the work, or even opposition to it, or disgust at it, on the part of sufficient numbers to deprive it of its national character. And we might fail by means of the armed intervention of powerful foreign nations. It is to the consideration of the last of these three methods of obstructing our successful prosecution of this civil war, that this paper is particularly devoted. In the meantime, while we will not discuss, at present, either the first or second class of dangers above distinguished, it is proper to express, in very few words, their special relation to the third class, and our sense of their own general nature.

We have put the case conditionally, in each instance; we *might* fail under the condition stated; we *might not*. It would

depend on the nature and extent of the controlling incompetency, or of the general dissatisfaction—relatively to the national force that could be relied on, and to the rebel force that could be brought into the field and managed well. Both the controlling incompetency and the national dissatisfaction that might exist, has direct and causal relation to whatever foreign intervention might occur: and whatever national dissatisfaction might exist, might have relation, more or less serious, to whatever incompetency might be supposed to exist on the part of the Administration, and the various officers, civil, military and naval, appointed under it. We use the word *incompetency*, in its widest sense—and with relation to the vast work set before the country. And we use the word *dissatisfaction* as applied to the people, with reference—not to the justice or propriety—but to the reality and the danger of such a state of mind on their part—and more especially on the part of the army. If these three things exist together—incompetency on the part of those to whose guidance our affairs are committed—serious dissatisfaction with them on the part of very large portions of the people—and foreign intervention by powerful nations; it is hardly conceivable that the nation could be extricated from the necessity of a ruinous and dishonorable peace, unless by means that, for the time, and perhaps for a very long time, if not in perpetuity, would subvert the existing institutions of the country; for example—a military revolt and dictatorship. The President may rest assured that his own fame, as well as his most pressing and immediate duty, demand the earnest consideration of these things by him. If there is in this nation competent talent, skill, and integrity to carry the nation triumphantly through its perils, he is entitled to its use, and it behooves him to secure it, in every department of the public service. Moreover, the great office he fills can not, under any circumstances, be successfully executed, otherwise than in accordance with the actual public sentiment of the nation itself; and least of all can that be done at a period of infinite public danger, and intense public excitement. He must lay his account, not only with the absolute necessity of having the real force of the nation, as to intellect, skill, and integrity, actually in its service; but with the absolute necessity, also,

of satisfying the public mind, that the fact shall be so. The nation is not satisfied; and its discontent would be respected and removed by a wise President—such as we trust in God Mr. Lincoln may prove himself to be. We do not speak of the discontent of traitors in the loyal States; they are bent on mischief—and so little sense have they, that their own destruction will probably be the first fruits of their success. Nor do we speak of discontent with any particular act of the Administration. But everywhere something is complained of, and every one has some exception to make, some regret to express, some apprehension to whisper. The nation needs to be reassured; and this reassurance needs to come from the center of affairs—from the hight of the Government itself. As to failure—failure is destruction. The nation will not endure it. The army will not endure it; we mean the real army—not the countless deserters—not the cowardly or worthless officers absent without leave, and useless everywhere—not the tens of thousands of sharks, with and without commissions, who plunder the people and the Government alike—blaspheming thieves! Half a million of American soldiers, veterans under arms, constitute a power greater than that of the greatest existing empire. It is possible for them to be destroyed in detail, by incompetent handling; it is possible for them to be prevented from doing anything—where folly, cowardice, or treachery, is intrusted with the control of them; but it is not conceivable that they will ever accept, and divide among them, the ignominy of having taken up arms to save their country, and then laid those arms aside by reason of a disgraceful peace, at a moment when they knew that if they were well commanded there was nothing under the sun that could stand before them. We will say no more, therefore, at present, about the first and second way in which we *might* fail in our endeavors to save our country. The powers which have been conferred on the President by acts of the last Congress, added to those he possessed before, put him in a position to wield the whole physical power, and the whole pecuniary resources of this great nation. We are not of the number of those who would grudge him any power he may constitutionally exercise, or cavil at any constitutional use of it; nor do we call in question his patriotic intentions,

in the use he will make of it. We trust in God the nation will be saved from the first class of perils we have indicated as arising from any serious incompetence, anywhere, in the use of these vast powers; and we earnestly hope the President will dispel the second, by dealing with the public discontent, on the one hand, in the way of vigorous repression of all criminal acts, and on the other hand in the way of wise and patriotic regard to public opinion. Thus, under his lead, by means of a triumphant national demonstration, our internal dangers may disappear; and our foreign relations might settle at once, into safe peace, or open war. Whether peace with all foreign nations, or war with one or more of the most powerful of them, is in our immediate future, is a question which depends on the Federal Administration, in part—upon the choice of foreign nations, in part—and mainly, perhaps, upon the course of events which neither our own, nor any other government, can either completely control, or even foresee. It may, however, be accepted as violently probable, that we shall be obliged to fight either Great Britain or France, or both of them, before our internal difficulties are settled—unless we are able to convince both of those powers that war with the United States is far more dangerous than promising to them. To this extent only, therefore, the Federal Administration can be held responsible for any foreign war that may occur—namely, that it probably would not have occurred if the country had been placed and kept in a condition of complete readiness for it. In connection with what we have further to say, we refer to the views we expressed a year and a half since, when the country seemed to be on the point of war with England.*

We knew a case in which property was devised in trust as a charity for the benefit of the *poor white orphans* of an Episcopal parish in one of our principal cities. The will was contested upon the ground of its uncertainty—seeing, as was alleged, that every term was vague; who is poor, who is white, and who is an orphan, being unsettled, in the intention of the testator. We leave our readers to determine for themselves what the courts should have decided. *Martinus Scrib-*

* *Danville Review*, Vol. I., No. 4, pp. 666-672, December, 1861.

lerus has given a case, with the pleadings and the result. Devised to A all the white and black horses of the testator; there proved to be six black, six white, and six black and white; the devisee A set up a claim to the whole eighteen. Terrible pending, proving, arguing, deciding; the devisee A finally lost all, upon the ground that the whole eighteen were mares. The devisees in the great cases of *Girard* of Philadelphia, and *Macdonough* of New Orleans, were in some respects about as uncertain, in themselves, and as troublesome, to the devisees, the lawyers, and the courts, as the real charity case, or the probably fictitious horse case above alluded to. And we have chosen to illustrate the practical nature of the *Law of Nations*—which concerns us so deeply to appreciate aright—by the practical administration of the *Statutes of Wills*; because the principles of interpretation in the two kinds of law, are the most similar. A will is professedly interpreted according to the *intention* of the testator; the *Law of Nations* is interpreted, as to matters at sea and along the sea coasts, according to the intention of him who is strongest in fleets—and as to matters clearly on land, according to the intention of him who is strongest in armies; for example, the great Napoleon and Mr. John Bull. It is with the latter gentleman, in person, with the case of *Mason and Slidell* already ruled against us in a way that riled most of us terribly, that we are to settle the *sea* Law of Nations, as he shall please—or fight; and it is with the successor of Napoleon, under his open and insulting avowal that his business in Mexico is to restrain our race, and that his policy requires our dismemberment, that we must settle the *land* Law of Nations, as will please him, or fight. Of course, we will fight them both if they insist on it. And it seems in the highest degree probable, at present, that they will both insist on it, unless we either disgrace ourselves by submitting to terms at once infamous and ruinous—or unless they get to understand that fighting us is neither safe nor profitable—or unless the course of events in the old world may render it particularly inconvenient for them to embark in a great war with the United States.

The attempt to reduce into a *code* the principles and rules by which civilized nations should regulate their treatment of each other, in peace and in war, is altogether modern. Some

very able and enlightened men have spent great labor in these inquiries, and in earnest endeavors to settle, according to true reason, and the law of nature, the numerous and often doubtful problems which they involve. But this code which professes to define the rights and duties of nations with respect to each other, besides that which natural reason lays down among all men, and which the Roman Civil Law declared was the true law of nations; is modified by the imprescriptable customs of the particular nations, and by the innumerable treaties, alliances, compacts, leagues, and agreements which they have made with each other, the principles of which survive and may be pleaded as a precedent, for a good end or a bad one, long after the instruments themselves have ceased to be binding. Moreover, just as the decrees of the Roman Pro-Consuls and Prætors entered into the life of nations throughout that mighty empire; so also the dispatches of great civil and military officers constitute a kind of perpetual commentary on this law that has no tribunal; and the decisions of the greatest judicial tribunals of modern times have interpreted many of these rights and duties of nations, in the light of their own municipal laws. In the daily life of the freest and most civilized people, all manner of devices are necessary, and are resorted to, in order to administer their own written laws, in such a manner as to satisfy the public conscience. As we have seen, wills are interpreted on a peculiar principle; deeds are interpreted upon another peculiar principle (always against the grantor); criminal laws are interpreted strictly; other laws according to their obvious meaning; and then a special jurisdiction is created (chancery) in part to supply the defects, and in part to rectify the evil of mere legal right. And, after all, in the administration of municipal law, with its plain written statutes and its impartial tribunals, and its able counsel, and its eager suitors; what we reach, in every litigated case, is a judgment founded on opposite and conflicting analogies, often so obscure and so subtle, that the most enlightened bystander is wholly uncertain what the judgment ought to be. Never was a nobler or wiser sentiment put into the mouth of a great nation, by one of its greatest heroes and patriots, than this: *We will demand of other nations nothing but what is right, and we will put up with nothing that is wrong.* Let us

immediately put our whole population upon an effective war footing; let us double our navy as soon as possible—and then immediately double it again; let us put our coast defenses, as quick as possible, into the best possible state of defense. These—and not learned dispatches—are the true preparation of our numerous cases under the law of nations, which, first or last, our very good friends, Mr. Bull and Mr. Bonaparte, hold in reserve for us; very forbearingly, no doubt, on their part—that is, waiting for a chance. We have more confidence in a common law-court and jury, than in almost any human tribunal; but, in our experience, which has been considerable, success there requires a good judge, a good jury, a good lawyer, a good cause, good proof, and considerable attention to details. We also have very great veneration for the law of nations—and would not be understood as desiring to implead either Mr. Bull or Mr. Bonaparte before a code, which has seemed in pastime to be the willing agent of England at sea, and of France on the land. But when they hail us there—as they are sure to do—we can not help thinking that our chances of getting honorably and safely through the case, will depend far more on our readiness and ability to maintain it, than on its merits, or their justice. Nor can any considerate nation ever permit itself to forget that it is out of the occurrences of actual war, that nine-tenths of the important difficulties under the law of nations arise; that war is one of the commonest methods of settling the interpretation of that law; and that of all codes of law, that one is the most fruitful of conflicting analogies and contradictory decisions—and therefore of grounds of delusion, and pretexts for violence and wrong. Nor is it improper to add, that of all nations, England and France could each be convicted on the testimony of the other, of having most flagrantly outraged the rights of other nations, and violated their own plain duties to them.

The state of Europe, and by consequence the principles of its public law, and the rules of their application to the relative rights and duties of European nations, have all greatly changed within the last half century. The quarter of a century, from the commencement of the French Revolution in 1789 till the treaty at Vienna, by which Europe, having

triumphed over that revolution, sought to extinguish it; witnessed the habitual and undisguised violation, on land and at sea, of every right and every duty of all nations toward each other—just as their passions or their supposed interests demanded. The treaty of Vienna was, in effect, in the place of the previous public law of Europe, as it had been understood before the outbreak of the French Revolution; and in all subsequent interpretations of that law, every outrage committed by powerful nations during the preceding quarter of a century of almost universal revolution and war, was liable to be pleaded in expounding the treaty which so largely superceded the law of nations by the new public law of Europe. The fifty years almost that have elapsed since the treaty of Vienna, have undone most thoroughly and effectually the work of that European council of nations; and the revolution it made in the public law of Europe has incurred a counter-revolution, not exactly back to the law of nations, but in a direction required by the supposed interests of the great European nations. In the meantime, also, the same half century has witnessed the supercession of the northern powers of Europe by its western powers, as the predominating nations. France, under the Bourbons, and under Louis Phillippe, was hardly felt in Europe during more than thirty years after the treaty of Vienna. England, either repudiating the holy alliance, or repudiated by it, was passing through a great internal change, and slowly recovering from the exhaustion of a great and protracted war. The northern powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, by their close union and their great united strength, held the absolute predominance until Louis Napoleon was firmly seated on the French throne. The close recent union of France and England—the immense development of both of these nations—the mysterious and daring policy of France, partly supported and partly tolerated by England—the war of the two with Russia—and then the war of France and Sardinia against Austria, have all resulted, as we have said, in the complete supercession of the northern alliance, by the western alliance, as the controlling European force. It has been said, with almost as much justice as severity, that Russia has been paralyzed, Austria conquered, and Prussia disgraced. While this alliance continues, the public law of Europe is whatever France and England may agree to consider it; and the law of

nations for the sea is whatever England, with the consent of France, may determine; and the law of nations on land is whatever France, with the consent of England, may determine; and in this sense both the public law of Europe, and the law of nations, will be enforced upon all who have not the courage and strength to resist the unscrupulous and savage domination of one or both of these nations. It is well known that these great nations, whose alliance is so dangerous to the independence and repose of all others, are full of mutual jealousy and distrust; and that nothing but their mutual fear of each other and their appreciation of the advantages they may both reap, from a combination which requires so many galling mutual concessions enables their respective governments to maintain, amid constantly recurring difficulties and embarrassments, a mutual good understanding. No one, probably, can venture to say less than that it is liable, at any moment, to be interrupted; that it is the interest of all nations to protect themselves against it; and that, while it continues, there is no outrage beneficial to either party to it, and not injurious to the other party to it, that may not be expected against the rights of other nations. The most important element of the public law of Europe is, perhaps, that which concerns the balance of power among European nations; and the most important element of the law of nations is, perhaps, that which concerns the independence of States, in their security from foreign intervention in their domestic affairs. And yet it would be perfectly easy to show that both France and England, separately and unitedly, since, by their good understanding and their concerted action, they have been able to menace all nations, have habitually aimed at dictation to Europe, and ruthlessly set at naught the independence of nations. At this moment, how is it possible to reconcile the conduct and avowed policy of France in Mexico—or the proceedings and intentions either of England or France with respect to the United States, with the independence of nations, any more than with the faith of treaties, or the peace of the world?

The rights of nations friendly to the United States, and bound to it by treaties, have been distinctly explained, both in England and France, as understood by very high authority in both countries, relatively to the government of this country, and to the rebels in arms against it. They contend, that

besides having a perfect right to interfere by way of friendly advice, with a corresponding obligation on our part, to consider seriously whatever they may propose to us; there are, in addition, three other distinct things which it is perfectly clear they are authorized by the law of nations to do, of which the first two are peaceful, and the third only is a war-like proceeding. Namely, in the *first* place, they might, with perfect friendliness to us, and as bound by the law of nations, extend to the rebels all the rights of a belligerent—that is, of a nation carrying on lawful war; and they might and ought to observe strict neutrality as between the Government of the United States and the comparatively small fraction of our citizens who took up arms at the beginning of this civil war. In the *second* place, now that they are perfectly sure the rebels have already secured, and will maintain, their independence, they may, in the most friendly spirit to us, acknowledge that independence, and enter into treaties of amity and commerce with these rebels; the only decisive consideration being, whether such an act would be for the benefit of their own subjects. In the *third* place, having acknowledged the independence of the rebels, they would be fully justified, at any moment the interests of their own subjects required it, in taking up arms against the United States in maintenance of the rebel independence. To such expositions as these, the English writers, up to the present time, nearly always add the strongest declarations in favor of English neutrality a *little longer*; avowing very plainly as the reason for that conclusion, the apprehension of immediate war with them on our part, which they wisely suppose is not specially advantageous for England. The French declarations do not generally exhibit any special apprehension of war with America; whether because no such result is seriously contemplated, or because it is already resolved on, or because the French do not fathom the real intentions of the Emperor, or that he has not played his American game far enough to determine positively what he should do, we can not pretend to say. The Emperor of the French is a very dangerous ally; but as he makes peace as capriciously as he does war, it is as difficult to appreciate his menace as to trust his promise.

It is not easy to state with calmness and patience, proposi-

tions laid down under the venerable name of law, but full of atrocity and insult; and all the more infamous, when the previous conduct of those who make them, is remembered. Suppose we should *advise* France to bring the Emperor to the guillotine—or *advise* England to strip herself of such of her possessions as she had acquired by fraud and violence?—demanding at the same time the friendly consideration of our advice! Suppose we should remind both of those nations, that the neutrality they both profess to practice, is little else than war in disguise against the United States? Suppose we should prove to them that their oft-repeated assurances that the rebels have acquired, and are able and sure to maintain, their independence, are acts of mere hypocrisy, supported by boundless and baseless falsehoods—known by them to be such? Suppose we should array the evidence before them, that whatever chance of success the rebels ever had, or have now, has resulted from the flagitious conduct of the British and French Governments—and, then, that the results of their own faithlessness have been magnified a thousand fold, attributed to the weakness of the American Government, and made a pretext for their right, under the law of nations, to recognize the independence of the rebels? Suppose we should demonstrate to them that their whole conduct, from their first outrage of eagerly recognizing the rebels as a belligerent nation—on through all their violations of treaties and of the law of nations, in giving the open support of opinion, of public sentiment, and of sympathy, and the secret aid of ships, warlike stores, and implements, necessities of all kinds, immense credits, and protection to the verge of war—up to the hardly concealed menace of early and actual war, has been covered up under pretexts at once false and base—the real motives all the while being dread of the power of the American nation—malignant hatred of its free institutions—and a diabolical and long cherished desire to frustrate its glorious mission among the nations? This, substantially, is our case in meager outline, against Great Britain and France. Does it justify us in considering, or calling them, *friendly nations*? Does it authorize us to place the smallest confidence in their professions of friendship? Does it excuse us for expecting justice, forbearance, or even peace

at their hands? Does it not—on the contrary—warn us to expect, at any moment, war with either England or France, or both of them? Should it not inspire us with redoubled heroism—that we may make that war, when it shall come, an occasion, one way or the other—for there are, as we will show, at least two glorious alternatives—of one of those sublime national triumphs—or one of those immense national retributions—to which only the noblest races have been found competent?

A good deal of stress has been laid upon the sufferings of certain classes connected with the cotton manufacture and trade, both in Great Britain and France; and upon the general derangement of trade and commerce, and the danger to the public finances in both countries, consequent on the failure of the usual supplies of cotton, by way of excusing the conduct of both nations toward the United States. The forms in which the governments of those nations have presented the subject, have been various; sometimes urging the right, if not duty, on their part, to put a stop to useless and uncivilized war in America; sometimes the duty of forcing us to supply Europe with cotton, which has become an article of prime necessity there; sometimes the necessity of putting a stop to a war which furnishes so many occasions of involving other nations in hostilities, with no possibility of advantage to the present parties to it. It will be observed that in whatever way the case is put, the right of foreign interference is always taken for granted, and the termination of the war in the independence of the Confederate States is always assumed as the final necessity. The feeling which actuates both the English and the French, thus manifest in all the acts and utterances of both nations, has been assiduously displayed through the press of both nations, in a manner the most deliberately infamous and insulting that has ever been exhibited by the periodical literature of any age; and this has been more conspicuous in England than in France. An individual, here and there, in both countries, and to a certain degree, a press, should be excepted from this condemnation; but such exceptions—few in number—are generally, if not always, connected with such conditions of their vindication of the United States, or such a method of advocating our

cause, as few enlightened Americans are willing to accept. The alleged recent revolution in public opinion in England, is distinctly founded upon the avowed intention thus to uphold the abolition proclamations of the President, as the condition of English approbation, and is but another phase of the same design to divide America on the slave line, which was organized in England thirty years ago—which has been in alliance with the ultra-abolition movement in America from its origin, and which has been, ever since, one of the prime causes of all our national troubles. The law of nations, as heretofore interpreted by England, means that the independence of China depends on the readiness of that multitudinous people to eat and smoke opium at highly remunerating prices, for the benefit of the English treasury, through the government monopoly of the opium of India. And the same law, as now interpreted both in France and England, means that the independence of America depends upon the prosperity of the cotton trade and manufacture in those two countries. The sufferings of any portion of mankind are to be regretted by good men. But it is time the American people fully understood that these pretended English and French sufferings for lack of cotton, are results of the deliberate policy of their own governments; are, in the main, pure fabrications of the two governments—equally silly and disgraceful to them—and are eagerly used as pretexts for outrages on the part of those governments, determined upon for different grounds. Every one can understand that the course taken by France and England, with respect to the rebellion in America, was the course, of all others, most calculated to cut off the supply of American cotton to the greatest extent, and for the longest time; and that now they have only to follow out that course according to its natural tenor, and bring on war with the United States, in order to make perpetual whatever evils a short supply of American cotton inflicts on their subjects. Among the many gross errors committed by the leaders of the rebels, not the least absurd one was, their confident reliance on the staples of their agricultural industry, especially cotton, as guarantees of their success, through the indispensable necessity of those staples to the great commercial and manufacturing nations. And now England and

France keep up this delusion among the rebels, by the pretence of suffering and ruin, which only cotton can cure, among great masses of their people, every wail from Western Europe being a distinct hint to the Confederate Government that intervention is drawing nearer, and a distinct intimation to hold out to extremity. In the mean time, and in order to enable them to hold out, immense credits are opened for the Confederate Government, upon pledges of cotton, both in France and England, which cotton all the parties understand may never be delivered; but the money thus furnished to the Confederate Government will be claimed from the United States as soon as the Confederacy is conquered; and the enormous interest allowed, added to the conviction that France and England will follow their usual policy, now specially illustrated by France in Mexico, induces capitalists to advance the funds, looking to be paid by the United States under coercion, as the fruit of our success. In whatever aspect our relations with France and England can be viewed, nothing can be more palpable than that those powerful nations do not mean that we shall succeed in this war, if they can prevent it without too great risk; and that if we do succeed, in defiance of them, they mean that our success shall cripple us to the greatest possible degree, and for the longest possible time.

We have already said that whatever incompetency, in the widest sense of that word, may be exhibited, or may appear to foreign nations to be exhibited, by the American Government, must necessarily diminish, in their view, the risk of carrying out completely their settled policy against this country. We have also said, that in whatever degree the dissatisfaction, division, and opposition among the American people, to the actual Administration and its policy, really weakens, or appears to foreign nations to weaken, the power of the nation, will, in the same degree, appear to them to diminish the risk incurred by them in dictating terms to us, and attempting to enforce those terms by war. It is true that foreign nations are liable to make egregious mistakes on both of these points; and it is the part of such great statesmen as we may chance to have in positions where such mistakes may be turned to account, to understand that such mistakes, well

improved, have all the efficacy of the sternest realities. The whole of that aspect of our national affairs, therefore, vast as its import is, presents innumerable contingencies, in dealing with which true greatness in rulers, seconded by true heroism in nations, are the first conditions of triumph and security. In like manner, as we have already said, a state of European affairs may lie behind the action which Great Britain and France might be strongly inclined to take with regard to American affairs, which may also present innumerable contingencies, about which we are as liable to be mistaken, as they are to be mistaken concerning us, but which, nevertheless, may deter those nations from attacking us except in concert with each other; and may, possibly, prevent that concert. Here we enter a field from which our traditional policy has always kept us as far removed as possible—the field of foreign diplomacy—except simply as it was a means of securing amity and fair commerce with all nations. But the time has come when European nations apply to the nations on the continents of North and South America—if not to all on the globe—their ideas concerning the universal balance of power, and concerning the special balance of power, also, between the nations on other continents, when their ambition, their interests and their lust of power, involve all nations, especially those nations of the Western continents, in the results of European diplomacy, and the fate of European combinations; when it is no longer a question with any American nation, of amity and commerce, but a question of independence and security, that obliges them all to make themselves be felt as vital elements in the great family of nations. What is thus forced on all American nations, is supremely obligatory on the United States, as the leading nation among them. To us, it is an immense change—one which those who have made our national life, perhaps, depend upon our accepting it boldly, will some day discover to be pregnant with influences upon the fate of nations, of which they now have no conception. But these results are in the womb of time. What immediately imports us, is to understand, as well as we can, that condition and probable course of European affairs which may deter any European nation, or combination, from risking a war of conquest upon the United States; or may, in the

progress of such a war, give us advantages not clearly to be foreseen; or may, on the contrary, encourage our enemies to attack us, or strengthen them during the war. The subject is unspeakably vast and complex, and is not familiar to more than a very small number of American statesmen, diplomatists, scholars, or thinkers. We shall treat it with great brevity, and in the most general manner.

With regard to England and France, there are some circumstances which put a very great difference between the two, with respect to their immediate and prospective policy toward the United States. In the first place, the British Queen is probably more the enemy of war with us, than the average of her subjects; while war with us, on the part of the French, will, if it occurs, be the exclusive result of the personal policy of the Emperor. Moreover, in the event of the demise of both of those crowns, the probable effects would be different; in France, such an event being, probably, decisive against war with America, while in England we deem it not at all apparent what effect such an event, or even a change of the ministry, would produce on that question. Still further, the complications of the Emperor of the French with everybody's affairs, and with every dangerous question in the world, far exceeds the corresponding complications of the British Government, so that he may incur embarrassments from that quarter, by serious war with us, far greater than the Queen of England would incur; while, on the other hand, the greater number and importance of the foreign colonies of Great Britain, and the immensely greater extent and value of her commerce, would make protracted war with the United States many times more perilous to her than to France. In addition, in the actual state of the world, and in the actual state of feeling between the French and English governments and people, it is not probable that either side would give to the other the great advantage which a separate war with America, by either of them, would give to the other. And finally, both of those governments must understand better than any one else can, that either of them is able, at any time, to precipitate affairs in various parts of the world, which would render their continued alliance in the highest degree precarious; that many events are liable to occur, any day, without

special procurement by either of them, which would produce the same effect upon their alliance; and that the effect of any such event, happening in either of the ways just suggested, would be of the most embarrassing nature, if it took place during actual united war, on their part, with the United States. If this is a just statement, nothing but English and French conduct and declarations could lead us to suppose that there was any serious intention, on the part of either nation, to bring on war with America; and nothing but the most important considerations on their part, could justify the risk of doing so. It is exactly that conduct and those declarations, which have obliged us to modify the opinions formerly expressed by us, and to which we have called attention, in a foot note, on a previous page. The modification we have been obliged to make, is very serious, and amounts to this, that both those nations are inclined, if not resolved, to press matters against us to the utmost limit their perversions of the law of nations will endure; and to risk war with us, in doing so, unless they become thoroughly convinced that the war they will bring on, will be far more serious than they now believe. It may be very difficult, independently of English and French conduct and declarations, to deduce from the state of the case we have delineated above, a probable conclusion on which we might rely, as to what either of those nations would feel safe in doing, with respect to us. In short, the case is like all others that end in hostilities between nations; a mixture of conflicting probabilities, each of which derives its importance from some other circumstances. And it is to be met, like all other cases of that sort, by the most careful endeavor to know everything, to provide for the worst, and to encounter whatever may happen with that wisdom and courage which make life the most triumphant, when it is the most distinctly valued lower than duty.

It is, probably, the universal opinion of English statesmen, that the supremacy of that nation at sea is the first condition of its security and greatness. To maintain that supremacy, no English sovereign, parliament, or party, has ever hesitated to perform any act of perfidy, or outrage, either in peace or in war, either upon enemy, ally, or dependent; and its maintenance is more clearly indispensable to the

greatness of England now, than at any former time, while the habitual immorality of the nation, on that subject, is virulent beyond all former precedent. The war of American independence, and the war of 1812-15, between the United States and Great Britain, wounded deeply the military pride of England; and the latter shocked, for the first time, her conviction of her invincibility at sea. In every part of England, the traveler sees monuments and hears names, that commemorate her great achievements in arms; and the popular enthusiasm never wearies in displaying them. But it is wonderful to behold the astonishment, almost the stupor, of an Englishman, when the American traveler demands of him, "Where are the palaces, the columns, the squares, the streets, the bridges, the arches, that commemorate the triumphs of your two American wars?" There is no such monument throughout the British Isles; there was never even a pretext for erecting one. The world speaks habitually of the desire of France to avenge Waterloo. If such feelings belong to nations, how much has Britain to avenge on America! And that such feelings are deeply cherished, they will the most readily admit who recall the burst of frantic rage all over England and Scotland, concerning the Mason and Slidell affair; who trace the whole course of British conduct during our present civil war; who examine the present state of British feeling, and the present tenor of British policy toward the United States; and who study the grounds, general and particular, of the policy of that powerful nation toward all others, that can possibly rival them in manufactures, in commerce, in wealth, in power—but above all, in maritime war. In all these immense interests, in which England has never tolerated a rival she was able to crush; or dared to attack, the destiny of the United States could not be accomplished, without her presenting herself continually before the whole world, in an attitude which England chooses to consider an attitude of insolent rivalry. The only idea that England has of the use of other nations, is that they should be safe and profitable customers to her. There are many grounds on which such a people might easily persuade themselves that the various conditions of such a policy would, in the aggregate, be far better fulfilled by the exhaustion and separation of the United

States, than by their continued union and growth; and there can be no doubt that, supposing the former fate to be the one desired for us by England, her conduct is well explained by such a desire. It is, no doubt, better for her, that we should be persuaded by her tender regard for peace and for us, to submit to our destiny, as expounded by her, than put her to the trouble, expense, and risk of forcing us to do so. As yet, therefore, diplomacy has not fully performed its office, and England will, probably, await the issue of the American campaign of 1863—and, possibly, of another, if that is not very decisive, before she does more than strengthen her present position. What American diplomacy may be able to accomplish, in the meantime, will depend upon the skill, the knowledge and the courage of the Government at Washington—the capacity of its diplomatic agents in foreign countries—and, not less than either, on the valor of our forces on land and water, and the competence of their commanders.

The foreign policy of France has always been an enigma to all but French diplomatists; and of all who directed it, or compounded it, from Philip the Second, of Spain, who, during his long reign, had many of the most conspicuous men in France constantly in his pay—not one has been less understood by his own generation, or apparently more absolutely a waiter on events, than the present Emperor. As far as he is understood, he appears to have accepted from the past—as far back at least as the Revolution of 1789—most of the settled ideas of his external policy, modified in some important respects by the actual state of the world on his coming to the throne. He accepted from the great men of that revolution the idea of making France a great maritime nation; and has pursued with great vigor the construction of ships, docks, and harbors, with special reference to the military marine of the empire. A great naval power is necessarily a great commercial one, or a great manufacturing one, or both. France was neither of the two—the idea of making her powerful at sea, originating in purely military views. So that the creation of manufactures, which had been destroyed by the persecutions of the Huguenots by Louis XIV, and the creation of commerce, which had been destroyed by the long wars originating out of the Revolution, and by the British supremacy at sea

during those wars, became the special concern of the government, side by side with the creation of the navy. Many considerations of position, population, climate, and production, fitted France to become a great naval, manufacturing, and commercial nation; and since the general pacification of Europe, by the treaty of Vienna, fifty years ago, her progress, in all these respects, has been prodigious. In the mean time, the wars that destroyed the commerce of France deprived her of her colonies. The present Emperor, by his recent treaty with England, made by him in the interest of French commerce and manufacture—made such concessions to England, in return for her coal and iron, that the industrial interests of both nations were added to the many other inducements to the good understanding between them, which is so dangerous to us, in our present circumstances. As a part of the same general maritime policy, the French Government, after the fall of the First Napoleon, accepted the policy of establishing foreign colonies, and began with conquering Algeria, in Africa. We believe there is no quarter of the globe in which Louis Napoleon has not occupied himself in adventures, sometimes openly, always manifestly, in search of new possessions. An Englishman could not be more grasping than he is. He has secured Savoy and Nice, and all Europe understands him to be seeking for Sicily, Sardinia, or anything he can get in Italy, and waiting on whatever event may enable him to seize the Rhinish Provinces of Prussia; while all the world knows what he did on the west coast of Africa, and in various and widely-scattered islands of the Pacific Ocean, and what he is now doing in Cochin China, on one side of the globe, and in Mexico on the other. England and the United States have both gold and cotton in their possessions. There is a wild story told by an American—which we will not repeat here in detail—that the French Emperor has inexhaustible gold fields in Central Africa, from which he secretly draws fabulous wealth—which mines, says the American, he purchased the knowledge of from him, and then threw him into prison, and robbed him of his papers and his pay, to secure the secret he had bought. But passing this by—the Emperor has neither gold mine nor cotton growing country of his own, and seems resolved to have both. This, no doubt, explains in

part, his present business in Mexico; and explains, also, the French intrigue in Texas at the period of its annexation to the United States, and the late renewal of that intrigue. Touching the rebellion in America, the moral support lent to it by Louis Napoleon, has been, we suppose, more decided than that lent to it by the English Government, and his intervention more direct. It is beyond our ability to say what he may do next. Possibly he may have determined on war against the United States, for refusing to accept his intervention. Possibly he may not declare war at all; may even refuse to co-operate with England any further touching American affairs. We do not see that it is possible for us to allow him to carry out the plans attributed to him in Mexico. He, however, denies that he has any such plans as are attributed to him. We have no interest in weakening France relatively to England; and it seems to us very clear that France, unless she is positively sure of her naval superiority over England, has no interest in weakening us. It seems to us impossible for England to allow him to establish a French Protectorate over Mexico, and by consequence over the Spanish States down to and beyond the Isthmus of Panama, and so over the transit between the two great oceans. And yet it may be that this is the very price paid him by England, for his effectual co-operation in the destruction of the United States! There again is diplomacy. What can be done on this French side, to ward off the effects of a combination, so threatening to the United States? What can be done with other European States, or interests, to anticipate and prevent the shock of a combined attack from France and England, or to enable us to resist it, and redress it, when it falls? So far, at least, we may answer: let us look the future steadily in the face, and be ready for all that can be attempted against us.

The fundamental necessity of the security of the United States, so far as that depends on diplomacy, is that our relations with one or other of the great powers of Western Europe (England or France) should be closer than their relations with each other; or, this being unattainable, that our relations with one or more of the great powers of Eastern Europe (Russia, for example, or the great German powers)

should be closer than the relations of those powers with England and France. By the former condition of things we would diminish, to the lowest degree, the probability of a joint attack from England and France; by the latter condition, we would increase, to the highest degree, the probability of the failure of such an attack, if it should be made; and by the union of both conditions, we should secure, in the highest degree attainable by diplomacy, peace with all European nations, by means of close friendship with some of the most powerful of them in peace, and alliance in war. We may observe that this state of things involves a great departure from our constant foreign policy, under the Federal Constitution, and is a recurrence to that of the Revolutionary Congress. It is a change based upon the new determination of the two greatest nations in the world, to subject the nations of these western continents to what free peoples must consider the system of menace, domination, oppression, and insult, which they habitually practice toward all weak nations, when they can do so with impunity. We may observe, also, that the utmost advantage we can ever obtain by diplomacy, can never be relied on as the principal, much less the sole security of our independence and liberty. And in like manner, it by no means follows that we must necessarily be sacrificed to the rage and perfidy even of the greatest foreign combinations, or to a disgraceful existence by their tolerance, even after diplomacy shall utterly fail. The life and the glory of powerful nations is in their own keeping; and the providence of God seldom forsakes those who are true to themselves.

Little more need be added to this outline, in order to present somewhat more precisely that general aspect of European affairs, out of which, as we have said, either France or England might produce, or out of which might arise without their procurement, such dangerous complications as would deter those great powers from risking war with the United States, or as might even break up the existing co-operation between them, while they were actually at war with us. If we look first at the Scandinavian States, in the north of Europe, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, we observe a decided movement toward the consolidation of them all into one great power—

which would elevate the three from their present insignificance, and constitute a great kingdom. On the one side, Russia has claims and objects, incompatible with such a result. On another side the Germanic Confederation raises objections connected with the Germanised Duchies that belong to Denmark. On the third side, England finds in such a result, security against the aggressions of Russia, security for free navigation of the Sound, and for free commerce in the Baltic, and security also against the increasing naval power of Russia. Moreover, the Prince of Wales has just married the daughter of the future king of Denmark,—the future king, most probably, of the united Scandinavian empire. But, in the meantime, the King of Sweden, the grandson of Bernadotte, has been at Paris, and “diplomatic circles,” as they are called, understand that the French Emperor will place him on the Scandinavian throne, in return for effective aid in carrying the French boundary to the Rhine. So, we enter by the German provinces of Denmark, by the dissatisfaction of the Germanic Confederation, and by the just alarm of Holland, Belgium, and especially Prussia, into the seething troubles of Central Europe. The German race has been, for two thousand years, one of the most numerous and powerful in Europe; and has kept itself weakened by its singularly absurd divisions, ever since the reign of Charlemagne. When the house of Hapsburg, under the dictation of the first Napoleon, laid aside the imperial title which had come down to them from the first Roman Emperor, and the reigning sovereign sunk down from Emperor of Germany into Emperor of Austria; the possibility of a final German unity existed no longer—except by means of vast popular revolutions, commensurate with this immense race. Subsequently to that remarkable event, at least three of these have occurred—each time changing the face of Europe. A State of the first rank in Central Europe has been accepted by European statesmen as a European necessity, ever since the treaty of Westphalia made the idea of the “balance of power,” the basis of the public law of Europe; and the constant effort has been to make Austria fulfill the conditions of a necessity which could only be fulfilled by the unity of the German race. We must leave to the reader to follow out this chain of facts and ideas.

Besides their own direct teaching, they connect themselves through the great non-German provinces of Austria, with Poland and Russia on one side; with Hungary, the Danubian Provinces, Turkey, and Greece on another side; and with Venetia and the great Italian question, on the third side. Southern Europe—especially Greece and Italy—seems to rest on a volcano. From the Baltic to the Mediterranean, those States and peoples are exceptions, in which great and perilous changes may not be considered as impending; or, in which such changes impending hardly would not, by their sudden occurrence, produce convulsions. No convulsion anywhere along this great range of States and people, which would seriously threaten great changes, or protracted confusion, could fail to modify, in the most decided manner, any hostile demonstrations against the United States by England, and more especially by France. Indeed those two nations well understand that such convulsions, in various places, would be precipitated by their own complete occupation elsewhere. For example—in Italy—the moment the French Emperor should be unable to repress them; in Syria, as soon as England should be disabled and France could cooperate with Russia; in Egypt, as soon as France was disabled, and England could seal that gate to India—Spain is virtually a dependency on France and England.

It must be apparent, we think, to all well-informed persons, that any just view of the actual state of Europe, is calculated to encourage, rather than to alarm, the people of the United States, in view of the menacing attitude of England and France toward this country. We expect nothing from the justice or good faith of either of those nations. We expect nothing of the highest importance, from any events which may be called casual, or fortuitous, as to ourselves. We expect little from diplomacy, we regret to say; and all the less, for special reasons which we forbear to express. Our great reliance is on the valor of our people—and the blessing of God. But it is a just encouragement to the nation, and a ground of praise to God, that innumerable circumstances in the present state of human affairs, do not leave those who are bent on our destruction, to pursue their course freely according to their desires. And if our enemies persist in their abominable

wickedness, many of those circumstances, over which we have little or no control, seem likely enough to work their more complete deliverance into our hands, and the more complete deliverance of nations, by our means, from a domination utterly selfish, relentless, and hypocritical. The partition of Poland, for which Russia, Austria, and Prussia have been held up to the execration of mankind by successive generations of English and French statesmen, is not worthy to be mentioned, whether as an act of utter perfidy, or as an irreparable injury to the cause of human civilization and progress, in comparison with the partition of the United States, which the Governments of the English and French people seem to have been carefully meditating for the last two years, and which, according to all appearances, they will consummate if they can. What a sublime display of God's mercy to our suffering race it would be if he should leave those two nations to fill up, in this attempt, the cup of their iniquity and make that attempt the means of limiting and repressing the enormous power they have so enormously abused!

It is a question by no means free from doubt, whether it would not have been a wiser and safer course for the American Government to have treated the recognition of the Rebel States as belligerents, by the European nations that first did it, as unfriendly acts looking directly to hostilities; and thus simplified our foreign relations, strengthened our national position, and placed the rebel war, as a question with other notions, on a different and far more manageable foundation. It is not less difficult to rest satisfied that the law of nations was rightly interpreted, or the honor of the nation duly consulted, or solid peace promoted, by delivering up Mason and Slidell, under menace, as an obvious afterthought, and after allowing the public sentiment of America to express its approval of their capture, in a manner not to be thought of without shame. The next step is the recognition of the independence of the Confederate States by foreign nations—which they profess to consider a peaceful, and not a hostile act—the natural consequence, as they say, of their recognition as belligerents and their proving, as they add, by two years of successful war, their ability to maintain their independence. We have

no means of forming a decided opinion as to the particular course that will be taken by the American Government, upon the happening of this event. The course which the national honor, as well as the national interest and duty demand, seems to us to be, that such an act should be treated as eminently hostile, short only of actual war; and that it should be met, on our part, by every means of injury to our foreign enemies, and of adding increased strength to our own position, short of a declaration of war. It is our opinion, moreover, that such an act on the part of any foreign nation—let it be disguised as it may, by that nation, or treated as it may by the American Government, or by traitorous factions among our people, must inevitably bring on war with that nation, or must accomplish the humiliation and partition of the United States. The final act is a declaration of war against the United States, and the armed support of the rebels; which may, indeed, accompany the acknowledgment of their independence, or may follow it in an alliance, offensive and defensive, succeeding a treaty of amity and commerce. The latter will probably be the course taken, especially on the part of England; inasmuch as it accords more naturally with the mixture of perfidiousness and violence, caution and outrage, which has distinguished every part of her conduct to the United States. Stripped of all pretexts and all contingencies—war on the part of England, and possibly of France, against America, is the direct conclusion of their principles, their policy, their conduct, their avowals, their view of their own interests, and their atrocious crowning object—the partition of the United States. Notwithstanding their ceaseless and countless falsehoods—they see that the rebels will be subdued; and they will make war for them, if they dare. Notwithstanding the immense and continual succor they have given disguisedly and perfidiously to these rebels, they see that their desires can not be accomplished in that way, and they will make war for them—if they dare. It is to be preferred that the declaration of war should be made by the foreign oppressor, rather than by us; and while the choice of war or peace is wholly with the foreigner, the choice of the way of making it, and the manner of bringing it on, is so far awkward to him, that a good deal of latitude, in those respects, will

probably be possessed by the American Government. What remains is to show that, if America is true to herself, and to the great part God has assigned to her, she may defy the foreigner, and defeat all his vile purposes toward her; or if she should prefer it, or the course of events should make it necessary, she may make just and terrible retribution upon the foreigner, for whatever she may suffer at his hands.

It will simplify what we have to say, and make more obvious the alternative that may arise in the progress of affairs, to treat the impending war under two distinct aspects. In the *first* place, as a purely *defensive war* on our part; that is, a war in which, so far as our country is concerned, we seek only what we have always avowed, namely, the preservation of the national life, and of all our national institutions in their complete integrity; and so far as the foreign aggressor is concerned, we seek only to conquer his armies and fleets, to drive him from our soil and coasts, and to damage and distress him everywhere, and in all his interests, in every way consistent with civilized war. But, at the same time, a war whose object is accomplished when the American Union and Constitution are fully reinstated—and the foreigner no longer molests us; never—until then. In the *second* place, as a *war of retribution* on our part. That is, a war in which, despairing of our rebellious countrymen, who call in the foreigner against their country, their race, their independence, and their freedom—we repudiate them as fellow-citizens, as they have repudiated us; but preferring them to the foreigner, we will seize from the foreigner territorial compensation for all we give up; clear the whole North American Continent of his presence and his claims (except those of Russia); drive him from the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea; and by a new combination of North American Nations, a new distribution of territory, and permanent offensive and defensive alliances—make North American independence and security forever complete; and, consolidating the whole power of the continent, hurl it against the corrupt and audacious combination that knows neither piety, nor justice, nor faith. In proceeding to explain, very briefly, our ideas on both these aspects of the war—both these alternatives set before us by it—we will speak as if that war were a joint one of England and France

against the United States. We do so, partly, to avoid repetition; but mainly because, in this manner, the most dangerous aspect of the situation is presented; and because, only in that event, does any necessity arise for considering the alternative of *retributive war* on our part? Whoever will consider the matter calmly will, we think, readily agree that any additional force which either England or France, separately, could bring to the rebels, would not seriously increase the danger of the United States, or render it necessary to resort to any extraordinary means of safety or redress. In that case, it would never be a question of compounding with the Confederate States, and forming alliances with the Spanish States of North America, on the basis of clearing America and its seas of the foreigner; as the alternative of the complete humiliation of the continent, and the forcible partition of the United States; but would remain simply a question of increased vigor in the prosecution of the war. It is by no means certain that the alternative of *retributive war* will actually arise—even if we are attacked by England and France unitedly. We propose to show that we can maintain our independence against both. But it is an alternative which it may please God that we should take. It is one full of vast recompense to us, and of vast danger and disgrace to England and France. It is one pregnant with blessings to mankind, inferior only to those which these superseded. It is one, therefore, which we should face manfully; and whose distinct statement may be our truest diplomacy, with regard both to England and France.

Considering the impending war as merely *defensive*, in the sense already explained, the suggestion of some leading conditions of it will explain, as fully as our limits permit, our conception of its course and result. And, first of all, it is manifest that the partition of the United States can not be accomplished by any hostile force whatever, without first conquering the loyal States; and that this can not be done except by a *land* force greatly more powerful than the land force of those States; that is, by a land force greatly more powerful than a million of American soldiers in the field, with at least three millions more in reserve, to take their places when they fall. The addition of a hundred thousand French veteran

troops, and of a hundred thousand English veteran troops, to whatever force the rebels might be able to keep in the field, would not, in fact, equalize the contest, much less give to the combined army the remotest chance of conquering the loyal States. We suppose that neither France nor England can ever land on our shores, and keep in active service, such a force as we have stated. The distance, the expense, and the uncertainty of the transportation by sea of such bodies of troops, with the necessary arms, warlike munitions, military stores, and means of support—in the face, too, of all the possibilities of naval warfare—seems to us to render the mere transportation to the theater of war nearly as difficult, as it would be useless, if it could be successfully accomplished. Moreover, the total destruction of whatever England and France might embark in such an enterprise, would not be the heaviest portion of the blow to their power which would attend its loss; the very sailing of such an expedition from the ports of Europe would shake the European predominance of these powers, and the first serious reverse to it would change the face of things upon that whole continent. Bear in mind, also, that military operations with a view to the conquest of our loyal States, must be carried on over an area several times as large as all Europe—an area occupied by little short of twenty-five millions of warlike people; intersected by impassable rivers and mountains; defended by forests not less secure than that famous Hyrcana from which the Roman legions recoiled; skirted by plains greater and more defensible than the deserts which have protected Arabian independence through all time; and occupied by cities rivaling the oldest and finest capitals of the world. But for the just indignation roused by such attempts upon the freedom of nations, and the deep abhorrence with which every virtuous mind must regard the scandalous prettexts upon which they are excused, the idea of two or three hundred thousand Frenchmen and Englishmen seriously setting forth to conquer and partition the United States, would be irresistibly ludicrous. We solemnly aver that if the rebels would agree to stand neuter and abide the result, we would be glad, and consider our cause much amended, to allow half a million of the best English and French troops that exist to land where they please in America,

and let the result depend on our killing, capturing, or driving into the sea the last man of them!

The *naval* aspect of the war may be supposed to be more discouraging to America. We can hardly agree that it is so. It is probable that the maritime power of France and England combined is greater than that of all other nations; and they would, no doubt, rely chiefly upon it, and use it very extensively. We have already seen that no imaginable use of a hostile maritime force can ever result in the conquest or the partition of the United States. The breadth of the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, varies from three to four thousand miles. One had as well think of taking the moon with ships, as such a country. On the contrary, our iron ships can be as conveniently built on navigable streams two thousand miles from the sea, as in our seaports. Naval warfare has undergone several complete revolutions within the living generation. The application of steam to deep sea navigation, about twenty-five years ago, and immediately afterward to ships of war, may be counted the first. Then, after an interval of many years, the free application of iron for the protection of ships of war; and more recently its exclusive use in the construction of vessels supposed to be nearly invulnerable. Upon this, human ingenuity was directed anew to the questions of cannon, projectiles, and the proper manufacture and use of powder, seeking some security against these invulnerable structures of iron; and it seems to have gone far in proving that no mere *coating* of iron which will not sink a ship, is sufficient to protect it against the newly-invented instruments of destruction. And, finally, the construction and use of the prows of ships, after the general idea of the most ancient maritime nations, so as with them to crush the enemy's vessels by actual impact, under irresistible momentum, at the same moment that the most destructive modern projectiles are fired into them, and boiling water is thrown in diabolical torrents upon them, seems to have brought the whole matter of naval warfare into a position which requires a great naval war to resolve completely its terrible problems. Perhaps England and France, as the great naval powers of the world, could not do better than to get the benefit of the skill and hardihood of American seamen, in practically resolv-

ing problems so vitally important to them. In the meantime, certain facts of very great significance appear to have been clearly established, and others rendered violently probable. As between iron-clad vessels and wooden vessels, the latter seem to be, under ordinary circumstances, helpless. In contact with iron vessels, wooden ones seem to furnish hardly an appreciable resistance, and iron-clad ones none that is serious. Iron vessels have not, we believe, come in conflict; in the case of the Monitor and the Merrimac, the better opinion is that the former escaped any injury, and the latter was nearly fatally damaged; but we do not understand that the latter was *absolutely an iron vessel*, while we do understand that her dimensions, armament, and crew were manifold the greater of the two. The ram fixture on steamships has proved itself utterly destructive against wooden vessels, and very seriously so against iron-clad vessels; but when used against the iron Monitor by the Merrimac, the injury was to the ship using it. If one could bring himself to think with composure of the boiling-water proceeding, it would probably commend itself as singularly efficacious against all rash attempts at carrying an iron vessel by boarding.

The sum of these results, as it bears upon American affairs, is of decisive importance. As a country rich in iron and coal, it has every advantage that any other nation has in the rapid construction of an iron navy, and incalculably the advantage of France, which is almost destitute of both. Possessing at the present moment more iron vessels of war in commission, and more in the process of construction, than England and France united, she is, for many of the exigencies of the impending war, on a footing of equality with her great maritime enemies. The course of improvement and discovery has suddenly rendered nugatory the overwhelming naval power hitherto possessed by those combined enemies. At this great crisis of her destiny she starts fairly with them, not only in the work of preparation for her present defense, but for that future maritime equality with the greatest nations, which her safety demands, and for which everything qualifies her in so preëminent a manner. The successive revolutions in naval affairs, which we have briefly alluded to, have produced effects as remarkable on coast, harbor, and river defenses against

vessels, as those we have pointed out with regard to vessels and fleets when engaged with each other. For iron vessels are apparently obliged to be constructed in such a manner that they are incapable of delivering their fire except in a nearly horizontal manner. Even field works of dirt slightly elevated are impregnable to them, as was abundantly proved, not long ago, by a fruitless and protracted attack of several of our best iron ships upon Fort McAlister, which seems to be a low mud work. Unite the two facts, that no ship but an iron ship can resist an iron ship, and that no iron ship can be successfully used against proper land defenses, and we have the elements of complete security for all land defenses against attacks from sea. One or two iron ships, with ram prows, might readily destroy the whole British wooden and iron-clad navy, if gathered in the waters about any of our principal seaports; while without such ships as can throw shot and shell at a higher angle than iron ships can throw them, no properly constructed land defenses can be taken from the water side. The truth is, the operations of the great British fleet in the Baltic under Admiral Napier, and those of the combined English and French fleets against Sebastopol, which are the latest foreign operations on a large scale, do not inspire much alarm, even where no iron ship coöperates with land defenses. And certainly the aggregate experience of our attempts during the present war, to take land defenses by attacks from the water side, even where no iron ship assisted the land defenses, are not calculated to terrify us with the anticipated attempts of any possible combination of French and British ships. We must remember, also, that the population in the immediate vicinage of nearly all our great seaports and cities which are open to attack from the water, is collected in such great masses, or is so situated strategically with regard to the general population, that no land force which could accompany an attacking fleet would be of the least use. The city of New York and its natural *banlierre* contain two hundred thousand persons accustomed to the use of arms, and capable of offering fatal resistance to a hostile force attempting to land in its noble harbor; and the various lines of access into the city could deliver them an equal number of such persons in a single week, or less. This is the case of our principal commercial city

and chief seaport, but it illustrates what is true, in different degrees, of all those of high importance which could be attacked in ships. So far as our seaport, harbor, and river defense is concerned, we have less ground for serious apprehension, than any one who does not carefully examine the subject would easily believe.

As a question of mere war—mere danger to America—mere help to the rebels, we are not able to perceive any special ground of confidence that England and France need rely on, nor any prospect affording reasonable hopes of advantage to the rebels, nor any circumstance suggesting unworthy apprehensions to the loyal people of the United States. It would be a war infinitely atrocious on the part of Great Britain and France, to the last degree disgraceful to our rebel countrymen, and accompanied, no doubt, with innumerable evils to all parties engaged in it, and to millions of human beings besides. Its unforeseen effects might be incalculable; those which might be foreseen as eminently probable, but which we can not now discuss, and will not even suggest, must be unspeakably important. We who have nothing to do but accept war, if it is forced upon us, as one of those unavoidable necessities which nations encounter, are the only party to it in a condition to reap important advantages from it during its progress, and to derive great benefits from its conclusion. It is hardly possible for any serious change in the state of Europe to occur during the war, which can turn to our injury, and which may not be turned to our advantage. It is extremely probable that one effect of the war will be to unite the population of all the loyal States, in a more cordial and unanimous support of our national life; and it is far from impossible, that immense portions of the Southern people will refuse to follow the flag of the foreigner against that of their country, in a war by which triumph can only deliver them forever to the domination of a domestic aristocracy supported by a foreign one more detestable than themselves—while defeat will rob them of their last plea for the sympathy of nations, or the forbearing construction of posterity. The history of public crime affords nothing more infamous in nations, or more detestable to mankind, than the calling-in of foreign tyrants against our country; nor is any lesson of the past

more uniform or more instructive, than the constant ruin and degradation of all who partake of such unnatural wickedness. We are slow to believe that the bulk of the Southern people will willingly submit to such a fate; and it will cause us no surprise, if war with the foreigner, in this quarrel, should prove to be a decisive step toward the triumph of the nation over all factions. A further necessary advantage of the war to us will be clearly understood, by recalling the damage and alarm created by two or three armed vessels under the Confederate flag, which have roamed, apparently at will, over the Atlantic Ocean, for many months past. When hundreds of such vessels, sent to sea by the Government, by individuals, and by companies—sent to sea singly and in fleets—fall upon the commerce and the colonies of our enemies, wherever their flags float or their interests exist, they will discover the difference between some temporary suffering and inconvenience of a few persons from a short supply of American cotton, and the want of bread to eat by millions of starving poor, accompanied by the blaze of captured ships burning on every line of commerce, and at the very entrance of every hostile port, and attended by that utter destruction of every assailable source of power and wealth, which the just rage of a heroic people, put on the defense of their very existence, will know how to execute. And our own people will discover that *open war* may not be more dangerous, and may be more profitable, than the *disguised war* which our foreign enemies have long diligently prosecuted, under every false pretext. The immeasurable difference in safety and advantage to America, as well as in loss and injury to her enemies, between merely guarding a portion of our coast against smuggling, and launching our whole naval power over every sea upon the globe, to work the utmost possible damage upon the two richest of all maritime, commercial and manufacturing nations. And, to mention nothing more, the conclusion of the war, even when considered merely as *defensive*, may well produce vast changes as in the relations of the colonial possessions of the British crown, especially of those on this continent; and equally vast changes upon the power and the pretensions of the Emperor of the French. But satisfaction for the past and security for the future, which none have more habitually or more rigor-

ously enforced, where they had the power, than England and France; appertain rather to the idea of that *retributive war*, to which we have alluded as a possible means of deliverance to America; and which we will now speak of briefly.

It is possible that many who unite with us in the intense conviction that the humiliation and partition of the United States by France and England, is a fate too horrible to be endured under any possible circumstances, may not share our confidence in the ability of the American people to defy and to defeat the whole power which both of those nations can add to the power of our own Rebel States, in the prosecution of the damning attempt. It is possible, also, as we must with all humility confess, that we may be much in error in the grounds of that unshaken confidence, which many others may repudiate; much in error, as many may think, in interpreting as we have done the real feelings and intentions of England and France toward the United States, and the true grounds upon which alone they will hesitate to proceed to extremities; and much in error, again, in our judgment concerning the natural and fatal self-delusion of that great hostile combination, on the question of their ability to crush us, without serious danger to themselves. It is, therefore, on these very accounts, important—as it is of itself supremely important—that the mind of the nation should be directed to every sober aspect of a subject so momentous. The northern portion of the nation rang with assurances that the Secessionists would never appeal to arms, until the fall of Fort Sumter broke the fatal spell. The vast trading and commercial interests of the nation may just as naturally and fatally delude themselves and others with hopes of fair dealing on the part of England and France, and consequent peace with them, until a succession of stunning blows awakens the nation to find itself on the brink of ruin. If, therefore, they who may suppose there is much error in what we have advanced, can be startled into the assurance that there is also much truth, and demand of us any alternative for the nation, better than submission at the dictation of France and England to our humiliation and partition, our answer has been given in the preceding pages. *Anything is better.* What is best of all, is manful war, with good hope of victory over all enemies united. If this be pronounced by the nation too

frightful in the sufferings it will entail, and the failure which it suggests, and inadequate, besides, in the lack of distinct and suitable redress for wrongs and injuries, in the attempt supposed, beyond parallel; and the demand be pressed for some other alternative, at once sure, retributive, and triumphant, we answer, yes, there is another, and, though not satisfying to us like the one we have discussed, a sublime alternative. Be sure of peace or of war with England and France. If war, take from the British crown her entire possessions on this continent, and her entire seaward possessions along vast coasts of the continent. Grant their independence to as many of the revolted States as desire to have it; making the condition of the grant, cordial and effectual participation on their part in exacting and enforcing the retribution in full; granting them, also, a due share of all retribution exacted from France and England, and guaranteeing their independence forever. Enter into alliance with Mexico and Central America, guarantee their independence and allow to them, as to the Confederate States, a fair proportion of new possessions in the Gulf and in the Caribbean Sea; driving the French out of Mexico, and securing the co-operation of that Republic and of Central America, in liberating the continent, and clearing it forever from the oppression of foreign nations. If the North American continent and States must enter, by the inevitable force of events, into the circle of European ideas and conflicts, let us enter, not separately and under the dictation of European combinations, but unitedly and invincibly—the equal in all things of the most powerful combination which the conflicting Kingdoms of Europe can present. Republican liberty is entitled to a dwelling-place on earth. The Emperors, the Kings, and the Potentates of Europe have driven out, by their atrocities, a population now numbering fifty millions on this continent; and they must not be allowed to renew their outrages on this side of the ocean. If the United States shall have no alternative but their own division—which may God forbid—the choice would still remain to her of entering upon her new career under utter humiliation and in profound darkness, or, of entering upon it arrayed in the spoils of those who came to spoil her; and leading a continent of free nations,

whose destiny her own heroic self-sacrifice had retrieved, and her genius and her valor assured!

We feel how hard it is to make or to tolerate any suggestion which looks toward anything but the integrity of that Union which seems to us so worthy of all love, and the perpetuity of those institutions whose like we shall never see again. We see how easy it is to cavil at much that we have written; how many things need to be more fully explained; how many that we have not even mentioned need to be profoundly considered. But, in proportion to their grandeur, all subjects, all ideas, brook the evils of ill-sorting, just as nations, by their very greatness, may endure misguidance, under which the feeble perish at once. Do men remember that it took the Roman Empire a thousand years to die? Can freemen forget that a few small and feeble provinces in Holland fought Spain for their liberty for nearly a century, during which Spain was the first power in Europe, and won their liberty and broke forever the power of Spain? We feel how bitter is the necessity, and how fierce is the difficulty, of subduing our rebellious countrymen, who bear no proportion to us in strength. What progress could they make in an attempt to subdue us? Let those who look with uneasiness on the proceedings of England and France, or hear their menaces with apprehension, take courage. It may be required of America, by Divine Providence, to liberate the world from the dominion of these powers. We may suffer much and long in executing that purpose of God. We may be obliged to make great changes, which we did not design, and which will be painful to us, great as may be our retribution. Still let us take comfort. To be the greatest of all nations if we triumph—to be the most renowned if we perish nobly; one or other destiny lies plainly before us. Who is not content to allow God to choose between them for us?

ART. IV.—*Chaplaincy in the Army.*

AN announcement has been repeatedly made through the public press that on the evening of the 22d of last February, one of the Major Generals of the army of the United States, known, too, as a devout Christian, declared in the Representatives' Hall in the city of Washington, that the chaplaincy system of the army has proved a failure. The reasons for this announcement, as we have seen them stated, are not, however, such as would justify the conclusion either that the system as such has failed, or that it should be dispensed with, and a different provision substituted in lieu thereof, as we shall take occasion to show hereafter. But the remark has been a thousand times repeated, not only by friends but also by the foes of religion, and has both received a construction and been made to favor an application which is as opposite as light is to darkness from the mind and intention of the distinguished officer who gave it utterance. He never designed to favor the impression that the ministrations of religion might be dispensed with as useless in the camp, or that our armies in the field and the troops occupying our military posts might be left without the regular and authorized institutions of the Gospel, so far, at least, as it is possible in the circumstances to have them regularly administered; but to convey the idea (so that a remedy might be provided), that in a great measure as heretofore conducted, and mainly since the commencement of the present war, the method by which such a result was sought, has failed to secure its great and desirable end. That the remark, greatly as it has been misconstrued, meant neither more nor less than this, we think can not be doubted. The whole subject is a deeply important one, and we propose to devote a few pages to its consideration.

In the *Revised Army Regulations*, published in 1861, the chaplaincy is referred to as follows :

"One Chaplain shall be allowed to each regiment of the army, to be appointed by the Colonel on the nomination of the company commanders. None but regularly ordained ministers of some Christian denomination, however, shall be eligible to appointment, and the wishes and wants of the soldiers of the regiment shall be allowed their *full and due*

weight in making the selection. The proceedings in each case will be immediately forwarded to the Adjutant General's office, the name and denomination of the Chaplain being in every case reported. Chaplains will only be allowed to regiments which are embodied and serving together as one whole—not to regiments of which the companies are serving at different stations.

"Chaplains not to exceed thirty in number are also allowed to posts. The posts at which Chaplains may be employed will be announced by the War Department, but the *appointment* will be made by the Council of Administration.

"The Council of the post will, however, report to the Adjutant General, for the approval of the Secretary of War, the rate of pay allowed to the person selected to officiate as Chaplain, and perform the duties of schoolmaster; the decision of the Secretary on this point will be notified to the commanding officer of the post by the Adjutant General."—*Article 24.*

In the appended "*Extracts from the Acts of Congress,*" section nine, the following occurs:

"*And be it further enacted,* That there shall be allowed to each regiment one Chaplain, who shall be appointed by the regimental commander on the vote of the field officers and company commanders on duty with the regiment at the time the appointment shall be made. The Chaplain, so appointed, must be a regular ordained minister of a Christian denomination, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a Captain of cavalry, and shall be required to report to the Colonel commanding the regiment to which he is attached, at the end of each quarter, the moral and religious condition of the regiment, and such suggestions as may conduce to the social happiness and moral improvement of the troops."

The *second* and *fourth* of the "*Articles of War*" refer likewise to the subject, and read as follows:

"It is earnestly recommended to all officers and soldiers diligently to attend divine service; and all officers who shall behave indecently or irreverently at any place of divine worship shall, if commissioned officers, be brought before a general court-martial, there to be publicly and severely reprimanded by the president; if non-commissioned officers or soldiers, every person so offending shall, for his first offense, forfeit one-sixth of a dollar, to be deducted out of his next pay; for the second offense, he shall not only forfeit a like sum, but be confined twenty-four hours; and for every like offense, shall suffer and pay in like manner;

which money, so forfeited, shall be applied, by the Captain or senior officer of the troop or company, to the use of the sick soldiers of the company or troop to which the offender belongs.

"Every Chaplain commissioned in the army or armies of the United States, who shall absent himself from the duties assigned him (excepting in cases of sickness or leave of absence), shall, on conviction thereof before a court-martial, be fined not exceeding one month's pay, besides the loss of his pay during his absence; or be discharged, as the court-martial shall judge proper."

We cite these articles because we shall have occasion to refer to them in the sequel, and that our readers may be able to view them in connection with the whole subject. They have been framed with great and commendable care, and after a very full and wise consideration of the matter. And those who charge them with deficiency and incompleteness, would better evince the propriety of their claim to sit in judgment by first making themselves acquainted with the facts in the case, and then by propounding a code in which the alleged deficiencies are supplied. We are quite satisfied that had these regulations been strictly adhered to, and faithfully executed in their true spirit, and according to the design of those who framed and those who adopted them, the system of the chaplaincy would never have been in any proper sense of the terms regarded as a failure.

As to both the propriety and importance of having an earnest and godly minister of Jesus Christ appointed to each of our military posts, and to accompany every regiment which is called into the field, as it has been, on deliberate consideration, recognized by our Government, and as there certainly can be no question on the subject in a Christian community, so it is obvious that any one either in the State or army, who should, at the present time and in the existing state of things, pronounce the measure a failure, would assume a responsibility in view both of the Government and country, which would place him in no enviable position, if such announcement were found to be based on insufficient data, or on hasty and premature conclusions. Such a judgment is undoubtedly premature in the existing state of affairs, and based upon occurrences which have transpired since the war begun. In the somewhat hurried and extemporized condition of our national

affairs, civil and military, the system of the chaplaincy has not had and could not have had a trial sufficient to warrant any such pronouncement. When our enemies in Europe pronounce, as they have recently so often done, that republican institutions are a failure; and that the war to preserve the Union is a failure; and that the Union itself is a failure, basing the representation on the occurrences of the past two years, we have unhesitatingly replied to them that the wish is doubtless father to the thought; inasmuch as the new complications which have arisen, although they have severely tested republican principles and institutions, have not by any means decided the question as to their durability; and that our enemies are quite premature in their conclusion that the events of the last two years have proved either that our war to preserve the Union, or the Union itself, is a failure. And when our enemies, moreover, have sneered at the unmilitary appearance of our soldiery at the outset, and at the want of military knowledge, as well as the actual incapacity of many of the officers who had been appointed to command companies, regiments, and brigades; what has been the response? And still further, what would the response of the country have been, if from such facts some high officer, either civil or military, had announced that the attempt to equip, train, and officer the American forces had proved a failure, and that several brigades, a large number of regiments, and very many companies were almost destitute of competent officers? We should have told him, and told him very plainly, that in the sudden and great emergency in which we were called to act, we have done the best we could; that many who had received the appointment of Surgeon, Captain, Colonel, and even General had received little or no military training, and were unacquainted with the profession of arms; and that it was, therefore, entirely premature to conclude, on the grounds asserted, that our military system was a failure; that if he thus sought to remedy the evil, the declaration was unguarded and unnecessary, injurious to the cause of our country, and helpful only to the cause of our foes.

The parallel between this case and the one in illustration of which it has been cited is sufficiently obvious, and need not be further drawn out or dwelt upon. For the same thing that is

true of the other officers of the army is true also of its Chaplains. Among them, likewise, were those who were wholly unfitted for their station. None of them, moreover, had been accustomed to military life, or to labor in the camp; and some were appointed in direct contradiction to the aforesaid military statutes, not being clergymen in any Christian denomination, or even professors of religion. Others were incompetent on the score of education; and others, who loved their work as ministers of Christ, and were in all respects well able to perform it so far as knowledge, piety, and intellectual ability are concerned, found their health fail under the pressure of official responsibilities; willing and anxious to do all that they could do, yet their physical system yielded before the drafts made upon it by the severe labors and hardships of the camp and field; as is true also of many other equally able and patriotic officers of the army. These facts being known and indisputable, it may well be asked why, and for what reason, is the chaplaincy to be thus singled out and pronounced a failure? And why should data, insufficient for such a conclusion in every other case, be deemed sufficient in this? Can satisfactory reasons be assigned for such a procedure? We think not.

That the brave and gallant defenders of our country and constitution should, on entering the army, be deprived of the institutions of religion, is an idea utterly abhorrent to all the feelings of a Christian community, and would not be seriously tolerated for a moment in our country. The Chaplain may not be able in certain circumstances to perform all or even half that his heart is set upon to accomplish; but if a true servant of his Divine Master and devoted to his work, he will watch his opportunity, and by God's blessing, his field, however unpromising it may appear at first, will yield its fruit. The value of the mere presence of a godly minister in a regiment, even though the untoward circumstances hereinafter to be referred to, should at times deprive him of the opportunity of preaching, except to a few, is truly great. Those who profess faith in the Saviour will be greatly cheered and comforted by his presence. He is there to counsel them and all, and to intercede for his charge at the blood-bought mercy-seat; to counsel and direct and attend upon the sick and wounded, and to

bury their dead. And can any suppose these to be trifles, and matters of no serious importance to the brave men who, for the time being, have severed all the ties and upyielded all the comforts of social life for the hardships of the camp and field, and to imperil health and life itself in defense of their country? The fact that the chaplaincy, as connected with our present vast army, has failed to accomplish all that was hoped from it, is sad to contemplate. But the reasons of that failure are not to be traced, we apprehend, to the supposed inutility of the office itself; and if they can be accurately pointed out and laid before the public, as they were in the case of the incompetent officers before referred to, we question not for a moment that the Christian community will not be backward to devise means for a remedy. And this is our design in proposing the few thoughts which we have to offer on the subject.

Very inadequate ideas have been entertained (and often freely expressed) by the Christian public itself, in relation to the whole subject of chaplaincy in the army. And many even of those who have sustained that office, as before remarked, seemed not to be aware of its duties and responsibilities. And while the importance and actual necessity of the office, are, as we have shown, fully recognized by the Government, and freely conceded by the public; its nature, duties, and responsibilities have not unfrequently been discussed in the most vague and indefinite manner; and conclusions vitally affecting the whole subject, drawn from the most inaccurate and insufficient premises. And this is in fact the true state of the case at present. Hence the necessity is apparent for obtaining definite and accurate ideas on the subject. For until they are obtained by the public, its action in the matter (should it act at all, as we trust it will), may as easily be in a wrong as in the right direction. And while they undertake to give counsel who practically know absolutely nothing of the matter; and while their counsels are applauded and their suggestions attempted to be carried into effect, all idea must be abandoned of arriving at intelligent and practical results, together with all hope of providing a sufficient remedy for the alleged failure aforesaid, and for rendering this arm of the service as efficient as it should be.

But we shall take occasion to refer to this point again on a subsequent page.

The office of the Chaplain is not that of a pastor, strictly speaking, and in the ordinary sense of that term; though it does involve all the sacred obligations of that office in reference to the care of souls. But there neither is, nor can there be in the existing state of things, anything equivalent to a church organization, a bench of deacons and elders; an administration of the sacraments, and of ecclesiastical discipline; or any investing of the office with that authority which is most cheerfully conceded to the pastor in his own communion, and which he is expected to exercise. And never were the wholly inadequate views entertained on this subject by many of our Chaplains more strikingly exhibited than the effort which they made in the Army of the Potomac, at the commencement of the war to inaugurate in the regiments a sort of church organization. The effort evinced a commendable zeal, but a zeal without knowledge in the true sense of the terms; and as any one at all practically acquainted with the duties of the chaplaincy, could scarcely fail to see, must result in disastrous failure. We say *disastrous*; because as it was wholly out of the question for any such attempt to succeed, so the office of the chaplaincy by being brought thus into association with it, the failure of this unadvised movement, could not, by many, be otherwise construed than as a failure of the chaplaincy itself. But the failure of this, and of any and every similar movement, and the fact, moreover, that there have been and still are unfaithful and incompetent incumbents of the office, prove no more against the importance of the office itself, than the fact that there have been a failure of some of our military plans of operation; and that there have been and still are unfaithful and incompetent officers in the army, would prove the military department of our country to be a failure; or the fact that there are unfaithful and incompetent pastors and missionaries, would prove the pastoral office to be a failure; and that the whole missionary enterprise should be abandoned. The extreme shallowness and inconclusiveness of such attempts at ratiocination would be at once detected and exposed on any other subject than that to which they have thus been applied.

We might in like manner proceed to show, also, that as the Chaplain is not in strictness of terms a pastor, neither is his office that of a missionary, if we employ this term in its ordinary sense and application, but this is unnecessary. Our design in adverting at all to such a train of remarks, is simply to present, in brief, a view of the mistakes which have been made, and which must inevitably be made in every effort to obtain a stand-point from which to contemplate and decide upon the duties of the chaplaincy, by viewing those duties and obligations through the medium of some other organization or institution. In England, or in any country, where a denomination is nationalized, there is less difficulty in finding resemblances and drawing analogies; and in the light of them deducing conclusions and prescribing specific duties, plans of operation, and the like; but the attempt to do anything of the sort in respect to the armies of our country, can not but result in confusion and disappointment.

The proper position of the Chaplain in relation to the army is clearly and fully recognized in the aforesaid acts of Congress and articles of war. He is to be a recognized minister of Jesus Christ; and as such is to preach the Gospel, and to labor in the best way he can for the spiritual benefit of those who have been committed to his charge. He is supposed to understand the duties of his office as a minister of Christ, and to be able to decide for himself as to the best and wisest method of performing them. Hence there is no attempt at dictation; and the whole matter is wisely left entirely to him. We say wisely; for the gifts of the ministry, and consequently the modes adopted for performing their work in this sphere, are as diverse as they are found to be in the missionary field, or in that of the settled pastorate itself. He is appointed to the office as a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. As such he receives from the Government his commission, and enters upon the field to do the work of his Divine Master. He can go in no other capacity, and in no other capacity can he be regarded as possessing authority. The work is assigned to him, and is before him, and he is to decide for himself as to the best method of performing it. And woe to him, if through negligence, or disinclination, or anything else under his control, he fail to perform that work! No one else can share his

responsibility, and no one, therefore, should presume to dictate to him in respect to the discharge of that responsibility—a thought which it would be well for some to remember, who, without any knowledge whatever of the subject, have been rather more forward than propriety would permit, in propounding their crude suggestions.

As to the asserted failure of this office during the past two years to accomplish what was expected from it, let the question, as already intimated, be adjudicated according to the same principles which are applied to the analogous cases to which we have also referred, and we ask nothing more. Candor itself must admit the justice and equity of this suggestion, and must also concede that the announcement of any such inference from such premises, was as illogical as it was premature. If the chaplaincy has not accomplished all that was expected of it during the last two years, how does this prove that the chaplaincy in the American army is a failure? We do not attribute the sentiment as thus expressed to General Howard, but are referring to the illegitimate use which has been made of what he did say. And in view of the matter, therefore, let it be remembered and considered, that the nation was taken entirely by surprise in regard to the existing war. A necessity suddenly arose for immediately collecting immense armies from the walks of private life. Many entered the service as private soldiers and as officers, who were not only unprepared for the discharge of the duties devolving upon them, but many who both in an intellectual or moral point of view were incapable of fulfilling them, and of course they failed in the effort. Such, too, was the character of many who entered as Chaplains, and of course they likewise failed in their department; and instead of expressing surprise at this, it would indeed have been surprising had they not failed.

We have not ourselves been personally conversant with such cases, and therefore can not speak of this matter from personal observation. But from representations brought before the public from sources whose veracity and candor can not be reasonably questioned, it must be admitted that not a few have entered upon the discharge of the duties of Chaplain not only with no adequate knowledge of its official

responsibilities, but who were intellectually and morally disqualified for their performance. We might specify instances, but this is hardly necessary. Some, too, as already stated, were appointed to the office who were not known as ministers of the Gospel, and who did not even profess to be such; and others who, though professing to be such, were not connected with any religious denomination. For, notwithstanding the aforesaid articles of war and acts of Congress are so very explicit on the subject, it must be recollected that at the outset those acts and articles were comparatively very little known even to the volunteers themselves, until after the regiments were already formed, and many of them in the field. It was indeed known that every regiment should have its Chaplain; but the directions in regard to his required status were not known. The Government, by a recent action, has very properly and with some success taken in hand the correction of such abuses, but let us not judge too harshly even those who were implicated therein. The difficulty in the way of supplying qualified incumbents of the office was very great. The churches themselves of the various denominations in our land, were and still are but inadequately supplied with a ministry, and it could hardly be expected that they should at once send off some eight hundred or a thousand well-qualified clergymen to occupy the office of Chaplain. At all events the abuse existed. And we may easily imagine what would be the effect upon religion and morality were the pulpits in our land to be supplied after such a fashion as the aforesaid. And is it, then, surprising that very little good and much evil has accrued to the cause of religion so far as such abuses in the army could operate? To look for any other results in the premises would be to expect grapes from thorns, and figs from thistles. And in view of this fact we only ask: Is it fair and just to attribute such a failure to the chaplaincy, when not only the true and recognized Chaplain had nothing to do with the matter, but when the failure itself occurred simply because he had nothing to do with it?

In the same connection it should likewise be remembered, as already remarked, that many excellent and able men have been obliged to resign the office on account of the failure of health in the discharge of its great responsibilities. But all

this can not surely be pleaded as sustaining the allegation that the chaplaincy is a failure; though we freely allow that so far as intellectual and moral incompetency and a failure of health are concerned, the results have not been what they otherwise would have been. There is, therefore, really no just ground on which to asseverate that the system itself is a failure.

This last topic suggests another which requires to be dwelt upon in the same connection. We advert to the difficulties which the Chaplain must encounter in the performance of the duties of his office in the volunteer army when in active service. Few who neither are nor have been associated with the army can know anything about them; and the subject needs to be brought out somewhat fully before the public, in order that it may be properly apprehended. These difficulties are multiform, and in many respects are such as are unprecedented to the Christian ministry in this land, and where immediate results are looked for, are extremely discouraging.

The army, as now existing, is assembled from every walk of life in our country. Every profession, trade, and calling, and every phase of religious belief and disbelief are represented. And with the feelings fresh from contact with social life, and with the still existing habits either of neglecting or attending on the institutions of religion, together with denominational preferences and prejudices in undiminished strength, the mass constituting a newly-formed regiment is found by the Chaplain to be in all these respects heterogeneous; and that the sole great and animating principle of union is, devotion to the sacred cause of our country. He will often find therein the pantheist, deist, rationalist, and universalist (and they in general not the most remarkable men in the regiment for taciturnity), and repeating the old cavil that the minister is only anxious about his pay; that religion is a humbug, and the like; and he will find likewise represented the Roman Catholic, and all the denominations of protestantism with their denominational preferences; and that in respect to not a few in the regiment, the denomination which he himself may represent, whatever that may be, is viewed with suspicion or prejudice; and that this is sometimes participated in not only by those who are members of churches, but who in their own denomination are regarded as truly pious and godly

men. Nor is this all; for he finds exceedingly prevalent in the army the idle and wicked notion that the duties devolving upon the soldier are incompatible with the duties of a religious life, and therefore that for the time being all attention to religion must be necessarily suspended. Hence he finds it extremely difficult, and often impossible, to learn who of his charge have ever made a profession of religion; and in his efforts to operate through the professed members of Christ's family, to get up a Bible-class, prayer-meeting, or evening-lecture, he is frequently frustrated. He must struggle on alone, very often, in all such efforts; and often when he brings such means of grace into operation, and begins to see the effect in the reëkindling of the fires of love to Christ in hearts that had been in a state of declension, the whole thing is for the time being arrested or broken in upon, by the necessary details for a march, scout, picket duty, and what not.

And then there are many of the men, who, though they would on no account consent to have the regiment destitute of a Chaplain, are yet backward about identifying themselves with him in his efforts; and require to be dealt with by a tact which is by no means the usual gift of the ministry, desirable as it certainly is. And the opportunity for private personal conversation can rarely be had, and in a manner never where the individual himself does not desire it. You visit them in the tents, and mingle with them at other times, but they are always in groups; except when sick or wounded in the hospital. True, a man of little sense and no experience in dealing with souls, would find no difficulty in any of these things; but the devoted and earnest and considerate minister of Christ can not but be brought often to a stand as to how to proceed, and what course to take in such circumstances; and deeply feels the necessity for constant prayer to the Fountain of all love and wisdom for direction. And then, moreover, agreeably to the military statutes, a Chaplain is not allowed to a regiment until its organization is in other respects complete. This provision, though important and perhaps necessary, yet in its operation can not but greatly enhance the obstacles in the way of a Chaplain's accomplishing the results at which he aims; that is, to bring the men under the saving influences of the Gospel, and to become instrumental in their conversion

and salvation. For it not unfrequently happens that the organization is not complete, until after a large proportion of the companies which constitute it have been for weeks or even months engaged in active service in the field. Where it is possible for one who may anticipate an appointment to the chaplaincy of a regiment, to be present with the officers and men from the incipency of its organization, which has sometimes been the case, and if the Chaplain's heart is truly in his work, the effect is marked, and decided, and delightful to contemplate. As pious men enter the regiment, they rejoice to find an opportunity to take their place in the prayer-meeting, Bible-class, at the evening-lecture, and at the public regimental service on the Sabbath; and also to coöperate with the minister of Christ (whom they expect to become their Chaplain) in everything whereby the spiritual interests of the regiment may be promoted. And this becomes the abiding disposition, and the work of conversion and sanctification still goes on, and its effects are perceived among the men everywhere. But when the reverse of this occurs, as it so frequently has in the exigencies of our war in the West, and when the companies, as fast as they are formed, are hurried to the field of carnage and death, the transition to a lukewarm condition in regard to divine things becomes fearfully easy, as facts so abundantly evince; the relish for the prayer-meeting and the other means of grace in a great measure ceases, and even attendance on the regular and prescribed Sabbath services gradually becomes a matter of mere form. The men having been for weeks or it may be months engaged in active service, fatiguing marches, and other duties which often greatly exhaust the vital energies, and being in the meanwhile deprived of all opportunity to attend the service of God or to enjoy the aforesaid means of grace, become in a lamentable degree habituated to the neglect of them, and when finally a Chaplain is assigned them, and when he enters upon the discharge of his duties, they regard the whole matter with indifference, and excuse themselves from taking any active part therein, or even from any seeming coöperation. Other ideas have taken possession of their minds, and they now pretend to have arrived at the conclusion that a profession of religion is incompatible with a soldier's duties, "not that

they have abandoned religion, as they say, no, they have merely suspended the performance of its duties for the time being, and when they leave the army they purpose to return again to the full performance of them." The effect is, the restraints of religion being thus thrown aside, the slightest temptation is found sufficient to enable sensuality and vice to resume their reign. We have known and been conversant with instances of this sort, the contemplation of which might make even angels weep. It can be easily seen how such a state of things must embarrass the faithful servant of God, and paralyze his efforts to do good. And then, further, if such are the effects upon the mass of those around whom the restraints of a religious profession have been thrown, when they are brought into the condition aforesaid, how fatally must the same causes operate upon those about whom there are no such restraints, but who have been moral and church-going people, respecters of religion and the like? The subject need not be dwelt upon, as every reflecting mind may easily imagine what the result would be. And in such cases we find instances innumerable, that all desire to attend the worship of God, and even all real interest in the matter of religion, have passed away from the mind and heart. And then, to complete the picture, it is necessary only to refer to the fact that the custom observed in the regular army and at the military posts of assembling the men and marching them to the place of worship, has been very extensively discontinued in the volunteer service; and that it is left optional with the men and officers whether to attend divine service or not.

The nature of the obstacles thus thrown in the way of the Chaplain, in his efforts to perform his work, may easily be understood and appreciated. For, as every man of observation and experience knows, the bare attempt to compel men against their will or inclination to listen to religious instruction, or to appeals made directly to them on religious subjects, can rarely be so made as to secure their serious attention; and, above all, when made in the presence of sneering and ungodly companions, is the sure way to frustrate the object at which we aim, and to awaken on the part of him we address either resentment or disgust.

We allude to these things, as already stated, merely to place

before the public the facts as they exist, and not for the purpose of discouraging any faithful God-fearing man from entering upon this field of labor. And it is the farthest from our intention to furnish excuses for negligence and indolence to any who may be already occupying the field. The difficulties and obstacles are great and formidable, *but they have been and they can be successfully encountered and obviated* by the faithful minister of Christ whose heart is in his work.

The difficulties to which we have referred may be found existing more or less in any portion of the army; but in the cavalry service (with which the writer is connected), there are often peculiar sources of discouragement, which perhaps can not be more appropriately presented than by referring to his own personal experience.

The regiment (MERRILL'S HORSE) of which he is Chaplain, and which, since the commencement of its organization in the summer of 1861, has been operating in North Missouri with great efficiency and success, was not completed, and of course had no Chaplain assigned to it until a large proportion of the companies of which it is constituted had been called into very active service in the field. And before he could signify his acceptance of the invitation to the chaplaincy, and enter upon the discharge of its duties, the men had in several severe actions encountered the enemy in battle. From what has been already stated in reference to this matter, our readers may easily perceive the result. The men, being without a spiritual counselor, and having little or no opportunity during that period to attend divine service, had become in many respects quite indifferent to the whole subject. Then when the regiment was fully formed, its companies, on account of the state of the country, were necessarily in some degree separated in order to occupy various important positions for the time being, with the view of operating most effectually in quelling the spirit of insurrection which was rife through the whole of the section which had been assigned to them. During the greater part of the past year some five or six stations were thus occupied, and at each of them the most active and decided operations were continually necessary. The youthful but thoroughly accomplished and heroic commander of the regiment, who from the very outset had, with

an assiduity unwearied and untiring, trained and disciplined his men, until they could be brought to operate with a terrible efficiency, which has made their name a terror to the disloyal element in the district; and having to a great extent introduced the *regime* of the regular service into his regiment, it can be easily supposed how severe in such circumstances must have been the labors devolving upon the men in standing guard, picket duty, and in scouting, foraging, fighting with and pursuing the enemy often for days or weeks at a time; and it can easily be imagined how difficult, under such circumstances, a Chaplain's duty must become.

He must, moreover, visit all parts of the regiment, passing from place to place where its companies are for the time being stationed; and this, on account of the disloyalty of a large portion of the population, could rarely be performed without considerable escort, which, in our small camps, would enhance the fatigue and toil of the men. And then, oftentimes after making persevering efforts to interest a sufficient portion of the men in the subject to constitute a Bible-class or prayer-meeting, you find on going to the appointed place that the majority of those who thus began to evince an interest in these matters have been detailed suddenly for a scout or some other important service, or that their turn has come for picket duty or to stand sentinel; while frequently we are placed in circumstances where there is no house of worship, so that on stormy days or in winter we are forced to employ a tent, which can, of course, accommodate but a very limited number; and thus we are forced to go over our work many and many times, and often when we imagine that it is getting under way, all our plans are rendered inoperative for a time.

In further illustration we here add an extract from a letter written by the earnest and devoted Chaplain of Harris' Cavalry, in the Army of the Potomac, and which was published in the New York Evangelist of March 19. After dwelling upon the general subject of life in the camp, he proceeds to say:

"The greatest hardship of the soldier's life in winter is picket duty. For instance, our whole brigade recently assigned to Colonel Killpatrick, left their comfortable quarters a few mornings ago, and went out on

picket duty for ten days. A cold wet snow filled the air, clung to and dampened everything. It settled on one's hair and neck, melted and ran down his back, producing a general feeling of discomfort. As the men formed preparatory to marching, their uniforms of blue rapidly changed to white, and as they filed off in the dim morning light they presented a shadowy ghost-like appearance. When you realize what it is to march eighteen or twenty miles in such a storm over horrible roads, and then form a cordon of pickets twenty miles long in a wild, desolate country, you have some idea of the not unusual experience of a soldier.

"When he reaches his destination, it is not a disagreeable journey over, and comfortable quarters in which to dry and refresh himself. All his conditions of comfort are carried on his person or strapped to his saddle, and he is thankful even for the shelter of a pine woods. Immediately on arrival, without time for rest, a large detachment must form the picket line, and stand over on the alert from two to four hours at a time, be it day or night. It should not be forgotten during these long winter evenings when the stormy wind sweeps and howls around your comfortable dwellings, that among the wild woods and hills of Virginia, or on the plains of the far West, the patient sentinel walks his desolate beat or sits like an equestrian statue on his horse, thus forming with his own chilled and weary frame a living breastwork and defense for your homes. Pray for him, that during these long lonely hours of hardship and danger our merciful God may excite within his mind thoughts of that better life and happier world where the weary are at rest—where even the names of enemy and war are forgotten."

These and similar facts may give some idea of the difficulty of maintaining anything like regular and stated religious services among the men, or of operating according to any fixed plan whatever, much less of following out the stupid suggestions of those who, without ever having seen a camp, undertake to prescribe the manner in which everything should be performed. And when there is taken into consideration how great is the influence of custom or habit in keeping up religious observances in social life itself, and that in the army and in the frequent absence of stated religious services the influences brought to bear in social life cease more or less to operate, its ties being in a certain sense severed for the time; and how all the aforesaid obstacles must tend to frustrate the efforts of the Chaplain to accomplish that kind of work which is needed for the spiritual benefit of his charge, the difficulties which beset his path may be to some extent appreciated.

We do not wish to dwell upon this point with unnecessary minuteness, but the exigency of the occasion demands some direct and plain remarks in the connection. Let any competent mind seriously contemplate the minister of Christ entering upon such a field. There is no such thing as a pastoral relation, with its reciprocal duties and obligations, existing or acknowledged by those committed to his charge; and in respect to that charge itself, there is existing no principle of association, but on the contrary, and as regards the religious element, so far as it is actually developed therein, he finds in a great measure the denominational preferences and prejudices which exist in social life alive and operative, and with such human aids and instrumentalities to coöperate with him, he enters upon the duties of his charge, that charge consisting of one thousand men and upward, together with their sick and wounded in the hospital; and in that charge, assembled as it has been from every walk of life, and on the single principle of loyalty to the Constitution and Government, he finds along with the perhaps faint development of the religious element, utter indifferentism to religion, and all forms of faith and unbelief, and too often those who profess the name of Christ not only unwilling to coöperate with him in his efforts, but disgracing religion by the most shameful backslidings, and justifying themselves on the plea that the life of a soldier is incompatible with a religious life; and while they rarely are willing to be approached by a clergyman, he has little or no opportunity to converse with them alone and privately, except when they desire it, and no method by which they may be brought, even on the Sabbath, under the preaching of the Gospel, attendance thereon being left entirely optional with themselves. In view of all these, and a hundred other things which could be enumerated, all requiring tact and time and perseverance and the most unfaltering energy to obviate, is it strange that great results have not already accrued from the Chaplain's labors? or that many good and eminently qualified men should hesitate to enter upon that office? or, that of the noble band of faithful men who have entered it, not a few should have found their health utterly fail in the work? and that others should at times almost yield to discouragement? And is it surprising, moreover, that when this

accumulation of the most formidable trials and obstacles is enhanced by the expressions of impatience, or of implied censure, and even sometimes of denunciation through public meetings or the press, from persons professing to be friends of the Redeemer and his cause, who yet are as ignorant as a post of the whole subject they pretend to discuss, is it remarkable that not a few able and faithful men should have become hopeless of accomplishing anything for Christ in such a field?

It is high time that the Christian community should cease to countenance this spirit of intermeddling, which, without effecting the least good, works evil, and only evil, and that continually; and as it ought not to be passed over in this general discussion of the whole subject, so we shall here improve the occasion to administer a rebuke which we trust may be effectual.

We have alluded to the remark of General Howard, at a meeting in Washington, and the unfortunate application which it has been made to bear, and to the fact that constructions have been put upon his language which were entirely foreign from the mind of that gallant and meritorious officer. General Howard unquestionably will admit that with the exceptions specified by us above, there is now in the army a large number of men sustaining the office of Chaplain, who, while they are, as respects patriotism and devotion to the great cause of freedom, second to no other men in the army, are as earnest and diligent and self-denying in performing the duties of their office as ministers of Christ, as General Howard and his brave associates are in performing the duties devolving upon them in their own department. Of the truth of this representation there is not room for a reasonable doubt. And, then, moreover, there are ways and methods for remedying the abuses and removing the difficulties aforesaid without unnecessarily increasing them, as can not but be done by unguarded remarks on the subject; for we do regard the remark attributed to General Howard as unguarded. And we have no hesitation to say that a communicating of the fact to the Christian community that a large proportion of the regiments of his command were destitute of the ministrations of the Gospel, with the expression of a wish on his part that they might be supplied (unaccompanied, however, by the uncalled-for and

discouraging statement that the chaplaincy was a failure) would have soon resulted in his procuring from among the best and ablest pastors in our country a volunteer supply for those regiments, until methods would have been adopted to render the supply permanent.

We attribute to General Howard no design or intention inconsistent with the sincerest and most devout attachment to the religion of Christ. We cherish his name with affectionate regard; for his life is, and, ever since his entrance into the West Point Academy, has been a standing refutation of the calumny that the life of a soldier is incompatible with a life of earnest devotion to Christ and his cause. But his remark (not as it was intended but as it has been applied) has been made the occasion for renewing in every part of the country the old tirades of abuse against chaplaincy in the army; and thus the spirit of impertinent intermeddling has been encouraged. For it has been so from the beginning, that the earnest, God-fearing, devoted men who occupy this office in our armies, have had not only the aforesaid obstacles to encounter in the performance of their work, and have found but little sympathy with them either in their charge or out of it; but, also, that they have had to stand up against "a fire in the rear," proceeding not alone from atheists and infidels and other despisers of religion, and from such little would-be wits as "Orpheus C. Cur," but from the thoughtless and inconsiderate remarks of some who are friends of Christ, and who seem to be truly desirous to promote the spiritual and eternal interests of our gallant soldiers. But, to make the whole matter perfectly plain, we shall here adduce a single instance out of many in illustration of our meaning. It is the one first occurring to mind, though others not less forcible can be presented.

At a large and enthusiastic demonstration on behalf of the army, held in St. Louis, Missouri (a report of which may be found in the *Daily Missouri Democrat*, of March 24, 1863), one of the speakers, a Mr. Brownell (reported as a "Corresponding Secretary and Agent of the Western Army Committee"), who had been spending several weeks with a part of our army in the South, undertakes, in view of such a remarkable experience, to enlighten the community on the subject of army life, duties of Chaplains, and the like, of which he

practically could have known nothing at all; and after referring with just commendation to an excellent post Chaplain in Fort Pickering—the Rev. J. Porter—he proceeds in the following strain :

“Immediately following the bloody carnage at Shiloh, almost a year since, I was privileged to assist Brother Porter and wife, with others, in unloading the City of Memphis, at Mound City Hospital. Soon after three o'clock in the morning, we went among that seven hundred and fifty, with every conceivable wound. What sights, what sounds, what looks, what utterances! Till seven in the evening, did that faithful husband and wife bend in almost parental affection over those wounded and dying men. *How many times I have wondered why there were so few such Chaplains! Is it not in large part answered, because they do not labor personally for the salvation of their men?*”

The only thing which could justify our attaching the slightest importance to such an utterance, is the position occupied by the speaker as connected with an important benevolent enterprise, the respectability of the audience, and the fact, moreover, that the remark, inane and senseless, and uncalled for, as it seems to be, is only an echo of what had been with equal thoughtlessness and ignorance of the facts, repeated substantially many times before. The remark, besides confounding the duties of a hospital or post Chaplain with those of the Chaplain in the field, openly announces that there are but few of the noble band of our faithful and devoted Chaplains who possess the very ordinary humanity to bestow in a like case to the one referred to, equal and affectionate attention upon their wounded and dying brethren! If this be not its meaning, then the remark is without meaning, and is a mere senseless and inane utterance, perverting and misapplying a fact in order to fabricate an occasion for joining in the clamor which ignorance has been attempting to raise against this class of officers in the army. But if, on the contrary, this be its meaning, as it seems impossible to doubt, then it is one of the most unfounded and atrocious calumnies that was ever uttered against a minister of Christ. And on behalf of the faithful and self-denying band of godly ministers who have freely left the comforts of home to minister to our noble soldiery amid the perils and discomforts of the camp

and field, we pronounce it an unmitigated falsehood and slander. A spirit which can in this manner either thoughtlessly or maliciously assail these servants of God, overburdened as they already are by toil and care in the discharge of their responsibilities, should not only receive no countenance among Christian men, but should be sternly rebuked out of existence. Many of our men receive and read the published accounts of such proceedings. And though it be true that such statements and declarations can do but little injury among those who are acquainted with the facts, and who sympathize with the Chaplain in his toils and labors; they do immense harm to those whose consciences begin to trouble them on the subject of religion, and who are ever on the alert to find reasons to justify their neglect of its claims, and of the appeals made to them by the faithful minister of Christ. In a like manner, also, it affects the openly impenitent. A general charge is made, as in this case, that Chaplains are unfaithful. These men being willing to think so, do not trouble themselves to inquire whether the charge is true or not, but taking for granted that it would not be made without reason, act accordingly; and from the time that this idea gains possession of them the power of the Chaplain to do them good is gone forever. And thus a slander, thoughtlessly uttered, effects all the injury which it could do, were it to proceed from deep-seated malignity.

It is quite in place to add here, also, that in most of the voluntary societies of Christian benevolence, the mere official is too often prone to forget his place. He forgets that he is not the society itself, but only its servant for the time it may choose to employ him. Not a few of the Christian enterprises of the age have been impaired in their efficiency and brought to the very verge of ruin, by the attempts of their officials to intermeddle with matters which are quite beyond or beside the scope of the duties assigned to them. The spirit is similar in manifestation to that which so often shows itself in churches; where certain individuals, often the least qualified and most illiterate, undertake to think and act for the rest—pastor and all—so that a pastor's labors must be performed in exact accordance with their senseless notions, or he is denounced as unfaithful; and from that time forth must encounter the full

amount of their hostility. In such a case who can doubt that such an intrusion is an outrage? Every pastor feels it to be so. The church has intrusted its work to him, and he is responsible for its performance. If he needs counsel he will ask it. And in the exercise of common privilege, he will prefer to seek it of those whom he thinks are really able to impart it. The attempt to force it upon him on the part of those whose ability to render it he can not but regard as more than questionable, is of very little use except to introduce confusion and disorder. So, too, as respects the matter before us.

Much has been frequently said in the same connection, and with equal want of discrimination, about "laboring personally" with the men for their salvation. And rules are not unfrequently laid down for guidance in the matter by those who, on the score of practical knowledge, prudence, or remarkable preëminence in any of the Christian virtues, are the least qualified to advert to the subject at all. But any one who will cast his eye over the aforesaid specification of the obstacles in the way of the Chaplain, as he enters upon his field, with ten or twelve hundreds of men under his charge, will not need that we here stop in order to repel such presumption. The gifts of Christ's ministers are various. But every true minister will, on surveying his field, pursue that course in which he believes he can accomplish most good. The matter should be left to him, without subjecting him to the annoyance of dictation and intermeddling on the part of those who, while they sustain no portion of the mighty burden of his responsibilities, are in no way capacitated to offer him either counsel or suggestion. Should a similar intermeddling be attempted in the case of the Surgeons, Captains, Colonels, or of any other officers in the army, its authors would soon be taught, and in a way that would insure the remembrance of the lesson, that it became them to confine their attention to matters which are legitimately within the scope of their talents and attainments. Let us hope that there may be no occasion ever to refer to this subject again.

The aforesaid methods of interference have been long indulged in; and, while they have accomplished and could accomplish no good whatever, have done evil, and only evil, to

the souls of men. From the very first call for an army, a considerable class, including all the foes of vital godliness, have opposed the appointment of Chaplains, as they still oppose the like appointment to Congress and to our State Legislatures. Not a few united in the opposition who would not like to be identified with that class of persons, because they themselves profess to have some regard for religion. It will be remembered, also, how, almost from the very beginning of the present war, this spirit showed itself; and how that, to some extent, a portion of even the religious press incautiously permitted itself to become the organ for its utterances. The office was decried, and insinuations thrown out indiscriminately against its occupants. It is a principle with officers in the army, and very extensively acted upon, to pass in silence assaults upon them from the people, whom they are laboring to serve; for they would rather suffer in silence than to give the common enemy possession of the facts which are necessary for their own vindication; and, though this principle does not, to the same extent, apply to Chaplains, and the subject under discussion, we have rejoiced to find that they have so extensively acted upon it. Nor should we have referred to the matter at all, except that it was unavoidable in a full and proper treatment of the whole subject under discussion. But we have been glad to find that in general no notice has been taken of these things by the faithful and devoted band of men who were thus assailed. They have quietly toiled on amid the obstacles which beset them, looking to God to follow their labors with his blessing. Here and there death has summoned one and another from their work, either by disease or by some missile of the foe, while they were animating their compatriots in battle, or ministering to the wounded and dying on the field, while others, through utter prostration from disease, contracted by exposures in the camp and on the march, have been obliged to retire from the work they loved. But, as a class, they have prayerfully borne, in patience and silence, all that this spirit of intermeddling and calumny has brought upon them: regarding the time as not having come when the whole matter would be set right with the Christian community. That time has, perhaps, not yet arrived; but it will come, and, while they patiently wait for it, they ask the

Church to give itself more fully to the work of supplying the army with the ministrations of the Gospel.

In respect to the best method of successfully encountering the aforesaid obstacles, it may be expected that we should here offer a word. But it is obvious at a glance that he who enters upon this field of labor should be brought fully to realize that his strength and resources in doing his work are preëminently in God. If he does not realize this, he has no business here; and if he does, he shall find that he does not labor and pray and hope in vain. Let him not only stand ready to improve the opportunities which may occur, but let him seek them amid all his discouragements, and he will often be surprised to find how God will go before him and make his path plain. If I may again refer to my own experience, I may be permitted to say that, notwithstanding all the forenamed difficulties which operated long and discouragingly, we have had many most precious seasons of interest in the regiment. And, not to speak particularly of the regular and prescribed regimental services on the Sabbath, never have I enjoyed more delightful religious services than we have had in the prayer-meetings, Bible-classes and familiar evening-lectures in the regiment. Small, indeed, was the number attending at first; and though often interrupted and, as already remarked, for awhile suspended, yet still kept up with increasing numbers and interest, and as delightful as I have ever enjoyed, or expect to enjoy, on this side Heaven. We have a noble regiment, and one of the best disciplined and most effective in the service. And words would fail me, were I to attempt to describe the emotions of my soul as I have joined in the songs of praise, and listened to and united in the earnest prayers of the heroic men who had stood undaunted, in our country's cause, upon frequent fields of carnage and of death.

And here I must say a word respecting those blessed efforts of the people of God who have labored so assiduously to supply the army with appropriate reading. What an incalculably precious help has this effort proved to the Chaplain in his work! A thousand and a thousand times have I had occasion to say from the deepest recesses of my heart, "*God bless them!*" in view of their abundant and most appropriate helps. Nothing could be more appropriate. The soldier can carry but little

with him besides his necessary equipage, and those neat and beautiful little testaments and hymn books are just the thing. And then the other beautiful little volumes, whose subjects are so admirably chosen—how much good have they done, in instances without number! And, likewise, the little tracts of the same character, which, after perusal, the soldier can inclose in a letter and send as a remembrancer to his loved ones at home, to whom any such thing which has been read and sent by the dear absent husband, or parent, or brother, or child afar off in camp, is such a treasure, and is read and re-read so lovingly by all the family. Never was the spirit of Christian liberality more thoughtfully and more successfully employed in sowing the seed of divine truth. And again we say, from our inmost heart, God bless the noble men and women who have thus thought of and cared and provided for the brave and gallant men who have so freely responded to their country's call, and stepped forth to the fields of battle and of death to defend her from the foe.

A Chaplain, moreover, should make it a great point to secure, as soon as possible, the confidence of the men of his regiment in his integrity of purpose and unfaltering desire to do them good. Let them become fully assured of this fact, and that he is one with them in hardships, privations, and perils, and he can, in a manner, do anything with them.

It was a most unfortunate circumstance for the chaplaincy of the whole army, and to which reference was made with terrible effect by the public press, when, more than a year ago, sundry Chaplains in a portion of the Eastern Army, which was about to move on to battle, concluded that it was not necessary for them to accompany it, and acted accordingly. It is true that the Chaplain, no more than the Surgeon, is necessarily required to go upon the field of battle; but it is, at the same time, true that the Chaplain who, in the sphere of obvious duty, will allow a regard to personal safety to determine or influence his actions, has no business in the army. He who would hesitate to accompany the brave men of his regiment when they are moving forward to bleed and die, if needs be, for their country, and, lest he should be exposed to danger, allow the wounded and dying to remain without the ministrations of religion, had better resign his office and go

home. The idea of a minister of Christ thus fearing death, and in such a cause, and shrinking from the post of ministering to those who need his ministrations, and that, too, when multitudes, who are not even professors of religion, go forth joyfully to face death in the sacred cause for which we war, is too humiliating to be dwelt upon. In such an hour, a knowledge of the fact that the Chaplain is near at hand is always a great satisfaction to the men. If he prefer not to go into the field of battle and minister to the wounded and dying as they fall, he yet should ever be near the Surgeon to whom they are brought. And it would have been far better for the army, and for the cause of our country, had those brethren all been slain in the attempt thus to do their duty, than that they should have adopted the resolution referred to. I know of nothing which so effectually opened the hearts of the men of my regiment to my efforts to do them good, as little events like the following, which I trust I may be pardoned for briefly alluding to, in the way of illustration: On several occasions when, at some of our stations, we were momentarily expecting an attack from an overwhelming force, said to be close upon us, I have lighted my pipe (for, to my shame be it spoken, that I have not yet abandoned the unjustifiable practice of smoking) and moved deliberately along the line of battle, conversing familiarly with the men, or addressing them in words of cheerfulness and animation. On one occasion, as I remember, after some new recruits, who had never met the enemy, had been received, the camp was suddenly aroused at midnight, and the men called upon to form immediately for battle, in view of an impending attack; and the gallant officer who commanded that portion of the line where the new recruits were stationed, observing that they appeared to be somewhat excited, called my attention to the fact, and requested me to speak with them. I did so, and, after addressing them for a few moments, found them not only calm and ready, but eager to evince their zeal in the hallowed cause of their country. These and a few other incidents, somewhat similar, wherein, also, duty called upon me to act, have not only removed the effects of the influence of such examples as the aforesaid from my regiment, but have given me an influence over the most

inapproachable of our men which it would have taken a long time to obtain in any other way.

As regards the specific duties of the Chaplain, the law under which he is appointed has, and, we think, wisely, said but little on the subject. He receives his appointment as a recognized minister of the Gospel, is supposed to understand his duties as such, and is expected to perform them. The spiritual interests and welfare of the regiment, so far as a clergyman can take them in charge, are intrusted to him; and the sick and wounded are, in the same sense, committed to his oversight. It is not only not to be supposed that an authorized minister of the Lord Jesus Christ could be at any loss how to proceed in such circumstances, but it is to be supposed that he would know, and that he would need little or no instruction in the matter. And hence, as already stated, the Government is concerned in appointing him to the field to do the work of a true and faithful clergyman, and not in prescribing his duties. In a late earnest appeal to the churches, by the New York Committee of the United States Christian Commission, to supply the army more fully with the ministrations of the Gospel, it is said that "the law under which Chaplains are appointed, defines no position, gives no protection, and *prescribes no duties*; so that the best men are liable to discouragements, under unfavorable local influences, and the religious interests of the army must be imperfectly provided for, until the law is modified." But we can not think that the representation is justified by the facts. For, as to his position and duties, they are those which appertain to him as a minister of Christ. The Government recognizes him as sustaining this position, and commissions him to perform its duties in the army; and, in the same connection, earnestly recommends all officers and soldiers to attend Divine service. Our enemies, also, are enjoined, by the highest official authority, to respect the Sabbath, and the hour for Divine service has also been suggested. By his commission, he is an officer of the army; his pay is indicative of his rank; and he is authorized to place any one under arrest who should attempt to interfere with him in the discharge of his legitimate duties. At least so we have always understood and acted, and no one has ever ques-

tioned our full right to do so. That the "Regulations" respecting the chaplaincy may be improved, is, no doubt, true; but we do seriously question whether the attempt to prescribe its specific duties would result in anything but embarrassment and confusion. The truth is, the men themselves not only fully understand the position of the Chaplain as a minister of Christ, but expect him to perform his duty as such. And it is a grievous mistake to suppose that he will forfeit his influence with his charge by strict and undeviating faithfulness in the discharge of those duties. Such is not the fact, though the reverse, however, is true. They expect him to be faithful; and no congregation in the world is more quick to discern any lack of faithfulness, or any inconsistency in deportment. The Gospel commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God; and the Chaplain who will not only preach the Gospel, but exhibit it in his intercourse with his charge, can not but effect great good among them. They do not expect him to connive at sin, or wink at immorality; but to reprove, rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. A contrary course will at once end all his influence as a minister of Christ, and effectually check all his power to do them good. I have now been with the army since December, 1861, and though, as all will testify, I have never hesitated to rebuke vice and sin, I have yet to receive the first unkind or insulting word from any one of the regiment, with the single exception of a man who was intoxicated, and knew not what he was doing.

And then, finally, to conclude what we have to say respecting the difficulties of this field of labor and the best method of surmounting them, it will be observed that when the aforesaid obstacles have been surmounted, the exhausting drain upon the Chaplain's time and energies has, in a measure, just begun. For when his labors and prayers and watchings begin, by the divine blessing, to produce their result, and the men begin to evince an interest in the subject of religion, he feels that notwithstanding all he has heretofore done, his labors and anxieties are but commencing. For now will the perpetual calling upon him at his tent for private conversation and counsel, and the desire expressed for religious services

and visits at the tents (other conveniences being out of reach), and his vain attempts to visit and converse with all who desire it, he finds incomparably more to do than he can perform. And with all his anxiety to do his whole work, he will feel that some are neglected. He must be at his tent at the hours when the men generally are off duty, to receive their calls; he must visit them at their tents; he must be at the hospital, for the sick and wounded can not be neglected; he must prepare for and attend his Bible-class, evening-lecture, and the prayer-meeting. He must likewise prepare for his regimental service on the Sabbath day, and for the services in the hospital; for a regiment is not the congregation for any man to attempt to address without thoughtful and adequate preparation. Often is the Chaplain compelled to exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things!" and full often have I felt like sitting down and weeping to find so little accomplished of all that I saw needing to be done, and which I had in vain endeavored to perform.

I have not overdrawn these representations. And now, in view of them, and the multitude of other and not less important facts which I have been compelled to omit, the question comes up before the Christian Church and public, What is to be done in the premises? The army has not only been greatly overlooked by a large portion of the Church as a benevolent field for enterprise, but the nature of the field itself has been greatly misapprehended. The question has to a considerable extent arisen in the public mind, whether the chaplaincy system had not better be abolished, and be made to give place to some other provision which might better secure the desired result. It would, perhaps, have been wiser first to have determined whether there is or can be devised any such substitute. As we are not willing, however, to share the responsibility of those who are attempting to abolish it, we shall in conclusion offer a few remarks on the general question, expressive of our views.

No proof can be derived against the system (as we have sufficiently shown), from the fact that insufficient, incompetent and even immoral persons have been appointed to the office. Such a state of things was perhaps unavoidable at the time of

its occurrence, and will pass away with the emergency which called it into being, and it can require but little care hereafter to prevent a recurrence of the like.

One of the worst and most reprehensible suggestions in relation to the matter, and which is the more surprising as emanating from a professed minister of Christ, is that preaching the Gospel is only secondary and of comparatively little account in the army. If this be so, then there is no necessity why ministers of the Gospel should leave their charges in order to occupy the office of Chaplain; a faithful colporteur would answer as well. But we have not space to enlarge on the point, further than to say that while it is God's plan "to save men by the foolishness of preaching," there are multitudes in nearly every regiment, who will pay no heed to religious services which are not conducted by a recognized clergyman. We may regret this, but such is the fact.

We hold and maintain, without the slightest hesitation, that the bare suggestion, come from what source it may, that our noble and gallant army might be on any account whatever left without the regular and authorized ministrations of religion, is criminal in a high degree. Why should it be so left? Is it because of the expense attending the effort to supply them? The man who, taking all things into consideration, should venture to assert such a thing, would deserve to be branded with undying infamy. Is it, then, on account of the obstacles in the way of properly cultivating the field itself? But this is no reason, as we have fully shown. Will the Church herself, then, plead that she is unable to supply those ministrations; and that the army, therefore, must be left without them? Nothing would more surely indicate that the spirit of Christ no longer dwelt in his Church, than the announcement of a conclusion like this. What Christian mind could for a moment tolerate the thought that the heroic men who, at their country's sacred call, have so freely stepped forth into the deadly breach to defend her at the hazard of life itself, may be left in such circumstances without the stated and authorized ministration of the means of grace, not because it is really impossible to supply them, but because it would require on the part of the Church some considerable effort and sacrifice to do so? In

the name of our gallant army itself, and on behalf of the loved and cherished ones whom they have left at home, and in the name and on behalf of our innumerable wounded, and sick, and dying ; and of the multitude who are yet destined to perish before this cruel strife shall end, we protest against such a thought, and against the lukewarmness with which the whole matter has been in a great measure regarded. And let the precious memory of our heroic and martyred dead put to shame and lasting silence the spirit of utilitarianism which would still attempt to place obstacles in the way.

We thank God that at length there is on this subject a movement, and in the right direction. And we rejoice that the noble body constituting the CHRISTIAN COMMISSION, whose unwearied toils and sacrifices for the good of the army will ever be remembered as conferring honor upon the age and country, have also taken this matter in hand. The late stirring appeal made to the churches by the New York Committee of that Commission should be deeply pondered by every church and clergyman in the land. The plan which it proposes, though designed only to be temporary in its operation, is yet the very best thing to be done in the present circumstances, for it both admits and calls for immediate action ; and while it is in operation, time will be afforded to the Church herself for further deliberation, and to devise means for meeting the requirements of the case, which shall be at least more lasting and permanent. We append the plan itself, in the conclusion of what we can now offer on the subject (for our article is already by many pages longer than we had designed), and trust that its recommendations will receive the prayerful and prompt consideration of all the churches and ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ in our country :

THE NEW YORK COMMITTEE OF THE U. S. CHRISTIAN COMMISSION propose the following plan, earnestly requesting its immediate consideration by clerical bodies, Pastors and Churches, and respectfully urging the promptest action :

1. The voluntary enlistment of at least one minister of the Gospel, of talent, position, and approved adaptation to this special service, for each brigade in the army—say 300 in all—during a period of two or

three months each. Every city or large town can spare one Pastor, at least—and *the best one*—for this noble work; his pulpit being supplied by his ministerial brethren of the same or of different denominations in rotation, or otherwise. Each considerable ecclesiastical body can thus detail a representative for the army.

2. Each volunteer Chaplain may be accompanied by a layman from his own or a neighboring congregation, under appointment as a Delegate of the Christian Commission, who shall aid in the distribution of the Scriptures, tracts, newspapers, and camp and hospital stores, and in holding meetings, or visiting the sick and wounded.

3. The service thus proposed should be gratuitous; but the Christian Commission will defray all expenses of Pastor and Delegate going to, returning from, and while on the field, and furnish all needed publications, stores, and other means of usefulness. On this system:

The Army would have a demonstration of the benevolence of the Gospel, and of its ambassadors. The very presence of a reputable, experienced preacher of Christ in the camp, on the one errand of salvation, with no earthly reward, would be a living sermon. Able and earnest appeals to the consciences of officers and men, sobered by the exposures and disappointments of war, from esteemed Pastors whose congregations have *lent* them for this mission of Christian charity, and whose motives to effort could not be questioned, must have great power. It would infuse new animation into the army. There is reason to believe that such labors would be universally welcomed by officers and soldiers.

The Pastors and Churches might expect a blessing on their joint self-denial.

The Country needs the example of Christian patriotism and devotion to so grand a spiritual object, as a counterpoise to the selfishness and spirit of faction so unhappily prevalent.

The Christianity of the country needs, for its own invigoration and revival, such a demonstration of unselfish vigor as would be afforded by the simultaneous devotion of three hundred of its ablest preachers to the volunteer chaplaincy service, among half a million of needy, waiting, dying souls.

30 Bible House, New York, March 3, 1863.

ART. V.—*The Puritans and their Principles*, by Edwin Hall. New York: Chas. Scribner. 1851.*

THIS is a volume of four hundred and forty pages, 8vo. In his advertisement, the author says:

"The following lectures were delivered to the First Congregational Society in Norwalk, Connecticut, in the latter part of 1843 and early in 1844. They are designed to set forth the causes which brought the pilgrims to these shores; to exhibit their principles; to show what these principles are worth, and what it cost to maintain them; to vindicate the character of the Puritans from the aspersions which have been cast upon them; to show the Puritanic system of church polity, as distinguished from the prelatie, broadly and solidly based on the Word of God; inseparable from religious purity and religious freedom."

In accomplishing this, the author found it necessary to "enter to some extent, and with some minuteness, upon the history of the Puritans and of their times; to trace their progress from the discovery of one important principle to another; to exhibit them in their sufferings; to trace the pilgrims in their wanderings to their landing upon these then desolate shores." To these lectures is appended a review of "Puritanism," "or a Churchman's Defense against its aspersions, by Thos. W. Coit, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, New Rochelle, N. Y." The careful reading of these lectures has satisfied us that Mr. Hall has performed, well and thoroughly, the task which he imposed upon himself in their aim, general outline, and execution, and made us feel that it is a pleasant thing to see the light—that it is much more pleasant to see the sun of truth in all his beauty, than to stand in the twilight—upon the dim line which separates between twilight and darkness, so dimly that it can not be perceived where darkness ends or twilight begins. It is refreshing, in the present time, to meet and converse with one who is so intimate with the history of, and so fully in sympathy with, such men and such principles as Mr. Hall here so ably vindicates;

* OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Neal's History of the Puritans; Macaulay's History of England; Hodge's History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; Foot's Sketches of Virginia and North Carolina; Princeton Review, January, 1850.

and rising from his entertainment we feel that "no man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth the new, for, saith he, the old is better." Being delivered in vindication of their subjects, these lectures are necessarily spiced with controversy. Throughout there is kept up a running fire upon the high claims of the British Crown in matters spiritual; upon the spirit of the English hierarchy, and upon the pretensions of prelacy in the United States; and after taking such a view of the Puritans and their principles as our author treats us to, in which we are made to see and to feel that the age of the Puritans was truly *magnatum* among the centuries, and that they made the times, in which they lived, great by their principles, and by their zeal and sufferings for the same, we realize that it is next to impossible to write up Puritanism without at the same time writing down prelacy, because of their inherent antagonism, and are prepared to enter into all the depth and strength of feeling bordering upon just scorn and contempt, which is excited in Mr. Hall while sketching the high claims and the high doings of the Crown and English hierarchy against the Puritans, and while reviewing what another has called "the frivolous and ill-natured work of Mr. Coit."

We find in these lectures a character of information and a service to the interests of truth which our present times much need; and in them we hear this generation virtually called upon to "stand in the way, and see, and ask for the old paths—where is the good way?—and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls." Not that all old things are good, nor that anything is good because old, for that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to perish, but that the principles of the Puritans were manifestly those of the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, and such as men can not reject without rejecting the very words of eternal life; nor that we should ask, "why were the former days better than these?" there being many reasons why such a question would not be wise in our mouth, and yet we know not that it would be anything amiss were many, in this time, to make an application of this question to themselves; charging upon their hearts the evils which the question by implication charges upon the times; and to the fruits of their own acts and the influences which the principles they are advocating are now exerting upon the

public morals, upon the national interests, and upon the state of religion in this land. For that each generation of men has failed to duly honor such as were sent specially to them in the name of the Lord, if they have not also rejected and stoned them, is a fact which is usually overlooked. That God has had from the beginning one path of duty for his people to walk in, one set of principles of faith and practice for them to maintain, cherish, act upon and inculcate, and, if need be, suffer for, and that this one way has not been delighted in by the great masses of mankind, and that these principles have been usually rejected and contemned when seriously and earnestly contended for and urged upon the hearts of mankind, is a fact not duly borne in mind; and that "we ought to obey God rather than men," seems to be a truth which has grown so old as to have become totally forgotten by many, though it be one of those truths which live and abide forever, though it be as valuable and important now as when first clearly perceived and distinctly asserted by the apostles when straitly charged by the ruling powers of their day not to preach, nor to teach at all in the name of Jesus Christ, and though all that is worth living for in the shape of civil and religious liberty, has come of God's people standing by this truth and sticking up to it, in their several generations, and dying for it rather than renounce it.

There always have been difficulties in the way of getting a true estimate of the Puritans and their principles into the minds of many. One of these has been the kind of men who have written of them, and whose writings have been most popular with the mass of readers. Some of these were morally incompetent to understand the real character of the Puritans, and others have written as though they had a divine calling to asperse them. Able pens have made it clear that Hume, Macaulay, and others, were not morally qualified to appreciate the motives, the ends, and the objects for which such men as Wickliffe, Cranmer, Latimer, Tyndal, Coverdale, Rogers, Hooper, Ridley, Knox, Cartwright, and others, struggled through those interesting and exciting times in which they lived and acted. While the Puritans were men eminently religious, taught of God, and having an unction from the Holy One, and strove for the rights of conscience, for the priv-

ilege of worshipping God according to his pure word, and the guidings of his Spirit those whose writings have done most to fix the notions of the mass of mankind touching these people, have been men who saw nothing worth contending for in the religion of Jesus Christ, and had about as much sympathy with paganism as with Christianity—at least, with the corruptest form of Christianity as with the purest. Sketches by such writers, drawn of such men, could not fail to be gross caricatures. Of Hume, Mr. Hall says:

“He spares no pains to stigmatize them as zealots whose principles appear frivolous, and whose habits were ridiculous. But Hume was a cold-blooded infidel, peculiarly bitter against Christianity in its evangelical form. To judge of the principles of evangelical religion as distinguished from a religion of superstitious forms and splendid rituals, Hume was incompetent. He could not understand the spirit that wrought in the Puritans, and hence his view of their activity was turbulence, their firmness willfulness, their zeal fanaticism—whether the principles of the Gospel be preserved in their purity; whether impositions inconsistent with the Gospel be laid aside; whether the Church of God shall be severed from the dominion of mere worldly politicians; whether the Gospel and its ordinances, given by the toils and blood of the Son of God, shall be left as he gave them, simple and pure, with power to secure the great ends for which they were given—these are matters for which Hume cares not, and concerning which he makes no inquiry. How lamentable that his opinions on these subjects should enstamp themselves on so many minds, and form, with scarcely a question of their accuracy, the prevailing sentiments of a large portion of the world!”

Of Macaulay, the Princeton Review of January, 1850, says:

“In many parts there are clear indications that he wants what we deem an essential qualification in a historian of those eventful times, deep and earnest religious convictions. The conflicts during the Stewart dynasty involved principles of infinite value both in religion and politics—principles entering into the very life of the church and state. The points raised by the nation in that grand debate were whether, as Christians, they should be free to follow the dictates of conscience, or be bound to worship God in a form prescribed by human authorities; whether as citizens they should be governed by law, or the arbitrary will of the prince. Now it never should be forgotten that while civil rights were at stake, they did not originate the contest. Religion was the occasion of it. It was a struggle to gain exemption from prescribed

forms of divine worship which aroused and quickened inquiry respecting political rights. The Puritans were the first men who unfurled the banner of freedom, and they never deserted it. Arbitrary power they always detested—the supremacy of law they always asserted. But grievances of conscience are widely different from grievances affecting the mere citizen. No one can be really sensible of the former without considerable share of religious knowledge, and an earnest conviction of its importance. The men whom Elizabeth and the Stewarts fancied they could bend and mold at will, were divinely instructed in the true nature and sublime objects of religion. In their view it was a thing of infinite moment, involving transactions between their own souls and the eternal God of awful solemnity. They felt that they had souls to be saved or lost; the fear of him who held their everlasting destinies in his hands excluded all other fear; so that, like the early heralds of the cross, they could give the calm but bold challenge to the haughtiest monarchs, ‘whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.’ We have adverted to the character of the men and the times, simply to show that no man is completely fitted to tell their story who is a stranger to the power of godliness.”—*Princeton Review*, January, 1850, pp. 104-6.

Another difficulty in getting just views of these people before the minds of many, lies in the fact that the friends of the English hierarchy, and of Episcopacy in general, have not been able to defend and propagate their views of church government, discipline, and worship, without speaking unfavorably of the Puritans. Ever since the reign of Elizabeth, Episcopacy has been the natural adversary of Puritanism, and where it has molded and shaped men's notions of it, these have been made unfavorable. There is a natural antagonism between the two. The one can not be written up without the other being written down in public favor. The one can not be shown to be scriptural, without the other being necessarily shown to be unscriptural. And those who take their notions of Puritanism from the representations of those who are the devoted friends of Episcopacy, must think unfavorably of the former. The principles upon which Episcopacy rests its claims, can not be defended without necessarily assailing the principles of the Puritans. And from Mr. Hall's showing, in his *Review of Dr. Coit*, Episcopal writers have been as sadly wanting in some essential qualifications to tell the story of the Puritans, as those who were either “cold-blooded infidels,”

"or those who were destitute of a good degree of religious knowledge, and of clear and earnest religious convictions."

"On reading the work," he says, "What do I find? A manful discussion of the great principles for which the Puritans contended? A denial of the persecutions inflicted upon them by the government and the Church of England? A vindication of the principles on which the Church of England claimed the right to persecute, *i. e.*, to make canons for the use of ceremonies and to impose the same by law? Nothing like it. He wanders over the whole history, as if utterly unconscious that any principles are at stake. He roams over those most stirring times of the whole range of English history, all unconscious of the great events transpiring around him. He is unable to comprehend the tremendous results depending—of freedom or despotism—of truth or superstition—of light or darkness—to the English nation and through them to so large a portion of the family of man. He can not see what made those times stormy—he can not comprehend what had wakened up so many minds to such prodigious efforts of genius, and what aroused them to such dauntless courage and self-sacrificing endurance. He goes through the field 'mousing' after the faults and follies, or inconsistencies of the great actors 'in those events, and he can see nothing else.'"

Mr. Coit's inability to "tell the story of the Puritans" may have come either of the principles of ecclesiastical polity to which he was warmly attached—or of his being in himself "frivolous and ill-natured"—or of both. But there can be no mistake as to the spirit with which he "tried to say unwelcome truths" of the Puritans. It was clearly the spirit which brought him into full sympathy with their long standing adversaries, and which would not only maintain all that Hooker ever wrote in defense of "the Church's power to make and impose ceremonies and require their use by law, but would also "justify the queen, her bishops, and her high commission," in all the severities which they inflicted upon such as scrupled obedience to such things.

But whether "cold-hearted infidels" write, or learned and attractive authors who are "wanting in" "true and earnest religious convictions," or men who are the natural and immortal adversaries of the Puritans—it is much to be remarked and lamented—that we have just fallen upon a time when many most willingly and gladly take their impressions of this

people mainly from the evil that is said of them. Latterly, many in the United States have assumed as true all the evil things that either infidel historian, godless and graceless novelist, or churchman, writing "at the special request of several bishops, and many of the clergy, made, not for the first, nor the twentieth time," has put upon record. For some cause it has lately become, in certain quarters, an exceedingly popular thing to abuse the Puritans and speak in abhorrence of both their principles and their characters—and all who still cherish any reverence and love for them. Of late their very name has become a stench in the nostrils of many professed Christians. Is it represented that the Puritans in the seventeenth century "were rebels, traitors, enemies, to God and to their King, ignorant, turbulent, seditious, unconformable to law, and revilers of both church and state?" Many Protestants in the United States, professing Christ, now gladly accept the representation as true. Is it charged that the controlling motive of the Puritans, in emigrating from England to North America, was "disappointed ambition at home?" Many professed Christians believe the charge. Or do others state that the motive of the Puritans, in coming to New England, was "mainly mercenary," and with a view to "engage in the cod-fish speculation?" Many professed Christians willingly indorse the statement. Or is it insisted that the Pilgrims, "who first settled New England, and whose posterity now people the Northern States of the Union, were, and still are, a race radically different from, and greatly inferior to, those who settled the Southern States; the former being the representatives and descendants of the roundheads and the latter the descendants of the English cavaliers?" There are even Presbyterian ministers and elders who love to have it so, and would have it become the cherished idea of the times; and whatever may have been the necessity and importance of examining the real character and principles of the Puritans—of "showing what these principles are worth" twenty years ago—these now exist in a twenty fold degree. For "the principles which are inseparable from religious purity and freedom" are now on trial in our country, and studied and concerted efforts are making to induce the great body of our nation to anathematize and repudiate them; and the future alone will be able to

disclose by what costs they will be maintained in their present issues. History must be made to take up their cause and speak again for them. Men of the conscience, faith, principles and struggles of the Puritans, began to appear in the persons of the apostles, who, in order to do their duty to God and men, had to engage in a serious conflict with the civil and ecclesiastical powers of their day; and found their justification in denying their authority, in the high principle that "we ought to obey God rather than men." And even public punishment, in the form of beating, instead of availing to drive them from this principle, only caused them to rejoice "that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus Christ." It is given to the earnest and strictly conscientious people of God, not only to believe in Christ but also to suffer for his sake. They that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution, must come up to their places among the great multitude arrayed in garments clean and white, out of great tribulation. Yet there were ways by which most, if not all, who have suffered for Christ since the world began, might have avoided their sufferings and still preserved their Christian name. There were compromises which they might have made. There were retractions or abatements of faith possible to them, and there were considerations that they might have suffered to tone down their feelings and convictions of duty, just enough to have turned the danger of bodily sufferings and escaped the charge of fanaticism, and just enough to have preserved a pretty good name and won a reputation for liberal views in religion. But in their respective times and places, God's zealous and earnest people have not been able to avail themselves of these things, and have felt that there was nothing in the divine principles by which their duties were regulated, nor in the example of Christ to encourage them to do so; who, having loved his own, loved them unto the end, and whose example, in resisting unto blood, we are required to follow, striving against and with whom we can be glorified together only, if so be that we suffer with him. Yet names of derision have been fixed upon God's people, at once characteristic of their principles and practice, and so applied as to bring them into popular contempt. From a very early day the term Puritan has been thus used in the Church; not

only has it been made a party name, but also a name of derision; and however "plain, unaassuming, harmless, industrious in both social and religious duties—condemning, by their doctrine and manners, the whole apparatus of the reigning idolatry and superstition, and placing true religion in the faith and love of Christ, and retaining a supreme regard for the divine Word"—any have been, this has not saved them from the names and terms of derision. Have any "insisted that the Church should be kept free from gross sins, and been zealous to preserve the Church in its holiness, as a society of innocent persons, who do not defile themselves with sin"—a society whose members exemplify the truth, that "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he can not sin, because he is born of God?" They were in derision called "Cathari." Under the Decian persecution many Christians fell from their steadfastness, but afterward professed repentance and applied to be admitted again to the communion of the Church. This gave rise to a question of conscience as to how they should be treated, and the clergy were divided upon the question. We confess that we can not deride the position taken by Novatian and his adherents; for piety and spirituality have always flourished in the Church in proportion to the promptness and the judicious rigor with which discipline has been administered. We may not expect all Christians to attain to such measures of grace as will insure their steadfastness to Christ under such a state of things as the Decian persecution; but surely we can find nothing to say against those who have such grace given them. And when these people professed Christ, knowing that they did so at the risk of life, and that they could not be disciples worthy of Christ unless they could hate their lives and lay them down for him; and then, being cast into the fiery furnace, heated for them seven times, and coming out without the smell of fire upon their garments; if they insisted that all others should do as they did in the day of trial—lean on God and take the consequences—we can but admire their Christian and heroic faith, and should apprehend that evil would overtake us were we to asperse them and seek to cast contempt on their principles.

Again, did any in the seventeenth century wish for a further

reformation in the Church of England than had been effected under Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; and a purer form, not of faith, but of discipline and worship, than was tolerated under Elizabeth, being aggrieved in conscience by the asserted prerogative of the crown in things spiritual, by the unscriptural offices imposed upon the Church by the civil magistrate, and by the prescriptions of the civil laws, as to forms, ceremonies, rites, and habits indispensable to the right worship of God. These, in derision, were called Puritans. And these godly men "complained of this name as being compounded of several heresies which they abhorred, and yet fixed upon them to their reproach." "We allow (say they), not of Papists—of the family of love—of the Anabaptists nor Brownists—no; we punish all these. And yet we are christened with the odious name of Puritans; a term compounded of the heresies above mentioned, which we disclaim. The Papists pretend to be pure and immaculate. The family of love can not sin, they being deified (as they say) in God. But we groan under the burden of our sins, and confess them to God, and, at the same time, we labor to keep ourselves and our profession unblamable." This was the original application of the name, but it soon began to be applied to any and every person who was very conscientious in keeping and doing the will of God.

If we would seek to know the Puritans, "in connection with the times in which they lived," the circumstances under which they acted, and with the developing of those principles for which they contended and suffered, we must start with Wickliffe and his followers, who, in the midst of the darkness of the thirteenth century, were the first to maintain that the Scriptures are a perfect rule of faith, life, and manners, and ought to be read by the people; and the first to translate the New Testament into the English language; the first to deny the supremacy of Peter among the apostles, of the Pope in the church, and who maintained most of the vital points for which the Puritans were afterward distinguished. Wickliffe and his followers incurred the displeasure of the then existing powers in the church and State to the same degree and for the same reasons for which the Puritans were deprived and made to suffer imprisonment, exile, and death. His writings, together with his bones, were burned by the decree of

the Council of Constance. Up to his day the weapons of the church had been only spiritual—no very severe laws had been enacted against heretics. But when ecclesiastical censures proved weaker with the people than Wickliffe's doctrines, in spite of such censures, his followers increased, and God's truth ran and was glorified in the midst of the greatest efforts to suppress it, and the killing of God's servants proved to be an especial means of swelling their numbers; the decree was issued by the Council of Lateran—first in the case of the Wickliffites—that all heretics should be delivered over to the civil magistrate to be burned. Upon suspicion of such heresy as Wickliffe was deemed guilty of by the ruling powers of both church and state, men were called upon to purge themselves of it, and upon refusing, this decree was rigorously executed upon them. Upon suspicion of disbelieving the doctrine of transubstantiation—the infallibility of the Pope—that the Church of Rome was the head of all other churches, or the supremacy of Peter over the other apostles; or upon the suspicion of their believing “that the Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, and ought to be read by the people—that in ministerial orders the Scriptures sanction only two—Presbyters and Deacons; that all human traditions are superfluous and sinful; that the ministers of Christ must teach only the laws of Christ; that mystical and significant ceremonies in religious worship are unlawful; and that to restrain men to a prescribed form of prayer is contrary to the liberty granted them by God;” men were liable to be publicly burned to death by order of the civil magistrate. So that we can not, on the score of character and principles, make a distinction between the Wickliffites of the fourteenth and the Puritans of the seventeenth century. We can not admire and reverence the one, and at the same time give good reasons for repudiating and condemning the other. Such was the state of things when Henry VIII. came to the throne. Some time after the reformation had dawned upon the church, Henry quarreled with the Pope, excluded him from the headship of the church in his dominions, and invested himself with the infallibility of the Pope, and held the consciences and faith of his subjects at his disposal, and visited with death all who refused to swear that he was King and Head of the Church. He fostered and perpet-

uated the doctrines, superstitions, intolerance, and cruelties of Popery. So that, while the nation gained much on the score of independence, the people of God gained but little on the score of Christian liberty, by the change from Pope to King as head of the Church. Up to the date of his quarrel with the Pope, Henry vigorously opposed the Reformation. But even after espousing it, for some time he sternly prohibited the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures, and such as were desirous of a thorough reformation, and attached to the doctrines of the Evangelical Reformers—were treated as heretics. Tyndal and others fled into foreign lands from persecution, and while in exile prepared a translation of the New Testament; and just at the juncture when Henry had changed his mind and for the first time given permission for the reading and circulation of the word of God, Tyndal had the New Testament all ready—corrected, translated, and printed. But it was circulated in the face of great difficulties. “The Bishops condemned it as full of errors—used severity against all who read it, and complained to the King against it in such terms as induced him to call it in. And over the subject of the right of the people to the Scriptures, parties were formed and the struggle commenced, which widened and drew into it all questions involved in the religious rights of the people of God, in after generations. The men who, under Henry VIII., took ground in favor of the free circulation of the word of God, and the unrestrained reading of it, and contended against the position of such as would deny the common people the word of God, on the ground that its general reading would “lay the foundation for innumerable heresies,” were the men who had caught the spirit of Wickliffe, and embraced his evangelical views of the Gospel, and of the prevailing Popish errors and corruptions in religion, and were the men who led the party of thorough and Evangelical Reformers under Edward VI., and whose spirit descended and reappeared in the Puritans under Elizabeth. The men who labored and prayed and suffered, in order to bring about a thorough reformation of religion under the several reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, were men of the same religious principles—the same faith, the same love of the pure word of God, the same views as to the proper

manner of worshiping God and of governing the Church. But the efforts made to withhold and suppress the word of God in Henry's day were special means under providence of bringing it into notice, and of causing the people to seek for it and eagerly read it, and bringing about a conflict between Scripture, truth, and Popish doctrines. "The people began to seriously inquire, Can men be saved by the use of holy water, absolution, extreme unction, and the eucharist, or must holy principles, deep repentance, and living faith, renew and transform the soul? And so earnest was the conflict that the King forbade all preaching, till he as head of the Church could set forth the scheme of doctrine in which all should agree." And he did set forth a scheme of doctrine for uniform faith, by mixing up, in the form of the Bishop's book, something of what both sides believed. He made the Scriptures and the ancient creeds the standards of faith, without the traditions of the Church and the decrees of the Pope. But the ceremonies, rites, and superstitions of worship were left almost untouched. It is said that "the alterations which he made in the rites of the Church were so slight that there was no need of reprinting the missal." He kept his strong hand upon the work of reformation within his dominions, and did not suffer it to proceed upon the principles of the right of private judgment and the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith—but limited it to his own ideas and conceptions, and such as did not submit to his judgments he pursued as heretics—precisely the ground that Queen Elizabeth took, and the course she pursued in the exercise of her prerogative in matters spiritual. So much to the grievance of the Puritans of her day. But let it be marked that there were men, in even Henry's day, who did not consent to his high claims as head of the Church, and who did not submit their consciences to his judgments in spiritual things, and who did, earnestly and in the face of great difficulties, dangers, and sufferings, pray and labor to have a more thorough reformation of religion made in his dominions, being men of same character, same principles, same aims, and occupying relatively the same position towards the civil and spiritual powers of their times, as the Puritans in theirs.

When Edward VI. came to the throne, "much was done in

removing superstitions and ceremonies. The Service Book, or Liturgy, was put out, reforming the officers of the Church, which, Hall says, "was gotten up under the general aim of pleasing both Papists and Reformers, taking out of the Papish Liturgy only so much as the Papists would stand to have taken out; and putting in only so much of the Scriptures as was the least that would satisfy the Protestants. Out of the Romish missals of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor (for popery had never required a uniform liturgy), they compiled the morning and the evening service almost in the same form as it stands at present." This was put out with a view to harmonize the sentiments and worship of the reforming clergy and the Papists, between whom a very serious and radical conflict sprang up as soon as Edward's liberal reign began. The reforming clergy assailed images, holy water, consecrated candles, justification by sacraments, masses, absolutions, and ceremonials, while the Papists defended them. Such acts were passed by Parliament as amounted to a total change of the established religion, but these were in advance of light among the people. The great body of the priests and people had not yet understood the truth, and were not ripe for these external changes. But the conflict of views between the reforming clergy and the Papists waxed warmer and warmer, and their debate of words began to reach the crisis of violence; and the King interposed and required these contentions to cease, and signified his intention of having one uniform order throughout the realm, and till that order could be set forth, all manner of persons were forbidden to preach save by special license. The King issued his Service Book, prescribing one uniform order, and by act of parliament all divine offices were required to be performed according to it under pain of severe penalties. The people were unwilling to give up their ancient rituals; a liturgy was therefore adopted that went in the direction of the Reformation only as far as the times allowed; and those who got it up as the best that the state of the times would permit, were not satisfied with their own work, but desired to have carried the work of reforming the service of the Church much further. But owing to the want of scripture knowledge among the masses of the people, and the very limited extent to which genuine

reformation had been carried among them, all that King Edward and his reforming clergy could do, was to "draw up their Liturgy from Popish originals," and leave the rituals and vestments retaining as much of the shape, fashion, and savor of Popery as would render them not idolatrous, with the hope of further amendments when the times would allow them.

Mary next came into power, and being a zealous Papist, she at once restored the papal religion, the Pope to the headship of the Church, and tried to undo all that had been done in reformation of religion under Henry and Edward, and put to death many leading Protestants; and to escape her fiery and bloody hands, many others fled to other lands. John Rogers had the distinguished honor of being the Lord's first martyr under her hands. Profoundly learned, enlightened in the true doctrine of the Gospel, and receiving meekly the truth as it is in Jesus, he was among the first under Henry to cast off the idolatry of Rome, and spend his energies in aiding the work of translating the word of God into the English language, and in preaching the Gospel in its simplicity and power. For these things, after suffering imprisonment and passing through three different trials before the zealous friends of popery, and always defending himself manfully, and while in his trials, many things "were put upon him to aggravate his sufferings, always preserving remarkable equanimity of mind, and finally yielding up his testimony with great joy." This is the man whose memory has always been precious to the hearts of God's people in all countries, and whose name, character, and piety the people of New England, a few years ago, took special care to honor. Forty years ago it was remarkable how uniformly the children throughout the United States first began to learn their A, B, C, in the New England Primer, presenting upon its front page John Rogers chained to a stake in the midst of flames of fire kept stirred up by Mary's executioners, his wife and children standing and weeping around him; and concluding with the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly.

Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, and was a Protestant. The exiles hastened home, and those Protestants who had hid themselves began to appear. But Elizabeth was not Protestant enough to risk the loss of her crown for the sake of giving

her people, at once, the Gospel in its purity. She used carnal policy in her manner of carrying on the Reformation. While she felt that it was important to uphold the Reformation, she also felt that it was important to conciliate her papal subjects, and consequently the public religion continued, for a time, in the same posture in which she found it; the popish priests kept their livings and went on celebrating mass; none of the Protestant clergy who had been ejected in the reign of Mary were restored; and orders were given against all innovations in religion without public authority. The acts of Henry and Edward were revived, restoring to the crown supremacy in the Church. These acts had been passed by Parliament, investing the crown with all jurisdiction in church and state, and giving to the prince authority to make laws, ceremonies, and constitutions, and without him no such laws, ceremonies, etc., could be of force. In Henry's time, "the Parliament had given to the king the prerogatives of infallibility, and bound themselves and the kingdom to receive upon trust, without question or examination, whatever dogmas or ceremonies the king and his prelates should be pleased to establish; and it was left to the civil courts to interfere with the ecclesiastical whenever it became a question what ecclesiastical requisitions were contrary to the laws and statutes of the realm." The leading Protestants, who had returned from exile, before leaving the continent, had been "pressed by the Reformers there to act with zeal and courage, and take care in the first beginnings to have all things settled upon sure and sound foundations; and had come home under strong convictions that it was their duty to do so, and to make a bold stand for a thorough reformation." They immediately joined issue with these acts of Parliament and this supreme power of the crown in ecclesiastical matters. They objected to the absurdity of a lay person, and that, too, a woman, as in the present case, being the head of a spiritual body. The Queen explained that she did not, as head of the Church, pretend to be a spiritual person; nor intend to "exercise any ecclesiastical function in her own person; nor challenge authority to minister divine service in the Church; and that all that was intended in her claims to supremacy was that, under God, she had the sovereignty and rule over all persons born in her realms, either

ecclesiastical or temporal, so as no foreign power had, or ought to have, authority over them." The Protestants were willing to die in order to maintain her sovereignty thus far; but they did not believe that the government of the Church was monarchical, nor that any single person, layman or ecclesiastic, ought to assume the title of supreme head of the Church on earth. In the obvious sense of these acts of Parliament, and in pressing this idea they soon found that the Queen did not stand by her own explication, and that she did claim to be supreme head of the Church to the extent of the papal idea; and by the act of uniformity which she soon caused to be passed, and the rigor with which that act was carried out under her superintendence and direction, she made them *feel* her supremacy. They soon found that she claimed to be supreme in matters of faith, and to have the power to say what was agreeable to the word of God, or repugnant to it; to hold the keys of discipline; to be the ultimate judge in matters spiritual; to have power to ordain such ceremonies or rites as she might deem best; to nominate bishops and control their election, and suspend them from office at her pleasure; that no ecclesiastical court or synod could assemble but by a writ from her, and when assembled, do any business but such as she might lay before it, and that its acts could be of no force without her sanction. And she did, with a resolute will, exercise all these powers; resist all attempts of Parliament to restrain her in them, and exerted her whole strength in keeping the Reformation within such limits as were strictly consistent with these high claims. And during her reign the Reformation could not be carried beyond what was in keeping with them. She published fifty-three articles specifying wherein, and to what extent, the Reformation should go, and commanding her subjects to reform their religion so far and no farther; and her commands were carried out by her commissions of visitation and high courts of commission to the letter. She fixed by law the order of lessons to be read in divine service throughout the year, and allowed no discretion to ministers and people as to what portion of God's word would be most for edification at particular times. She went to the full length of her asserted prerogative in specifying minutely how ministers of the Gospel should be dressed while

officiating, and in appointing and regulating rites and ceremonies; and the Parliament even "empowered her to ordain and publish such farther ceremonies and rites as may be for the advancement of God's glory, and edifying his Church and the reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments." But she exercised her prerogative in all these things much to the grievance of the consciences of the stricter Protestants, and much in favor of her papal subjects. She caused King Edward's Liturgy to be reviewed, and all passages offensive to the Pope to be stricken out, and made such changes in it as tended to conciliate the Papists, restoring the practice of kneeling at the sacrament in adoration of the corporeal presence—restoring the Romish festivals and the Popish habits. When her real mind was understood, it was ascertained that she thought her brother had carried the Reformation too far, and she was unwilling to go to the same length to which he had gone. In King Edward's Liturgy all the Popish garments had been laid aside except the surplice; but she ordered the full Popish habit to be used, and being thus changed, the Liturgy was by Parliament given the force of law, and acts were passed requiring all the people to conform their worship to it (June 24, 1559).

At this time the Protestants were all of one faith. They agreed in doctrines, but differed widely as to church government, discipline, and ceremonies. Some heartily conceded to the Queen all the authority in the Church which she claimed, and the acts of Parliament gave her. These were styled the Court Reformers. But the stricter Protestants, who began now to be styled in derision of their conscience and evangelical views of divine things, *Puritans*, did not believe that the crown ought to have such powers in the Church, and held that such powers were not agreeable to the Scriptures, nor to the natural rights of mankind. And we can not follow them in all the conflicts in which they engaged for the purpose of maintaining the honor and purity of Christ's laws and worship, and mark the spirit that inspired them, and feel the power of their arguments against the views of their adversaries and in support of their own, without feeling that the spirit of glory and of God did rest upon them, and that the Holy Ghost did, in a certain sense, speak in them. "There were many things

which caused them to be dissatisfied with the hierarchy, and which they labored throughout the reign of Elizabeth to have removed." We need notice but a few of these. And first of all was the asserted prerogative of the crown in matters spiritual. They contended that "the powers of the civil magistrate relate chiefly to the civil welfare of his subjects, and the protection of them in the enjoyment of their civil and religious rights; and that there is no passage in the New Testament which gives him a commission to be lord over the consciences of his subjects, or to have dominion over their faith. Also, that such power is not agreeable to reason, because religion ought to be the effect of a free and deliberate choice. They asked: Why must we believe as the King believes, any more than as the Pope believes? Also, that it was unreasonable that the religion of a whole nation should be at the disposal of a single lay person; and that if the civil magistrate be the sole lawgiver of the Church, he may ordain at pleasure, dispense with scriptural laws, and enjoin such as are unscriptural, and lawfully do what Mary did when she restored the papacy, and bind the consciences of her subjects to be good Papists, or errorists of any class; and to the last, and without fear of the certainty of great sufferings as the consequence, they insisted and maintained that the spiritual authority of the Church is invested in her spiritual officers. And surely Presbyterians in the United States ought to be the last of men to think slightly of them for holding such views on this point.

Again, the Court Reformers held the Scriptures to be a perfect rule of faith, but not a perfect standard of church government and discipline; and that the Saviour and his apostles left it to the discretion of the civil magistrate to accommodate the government of the Church to the policy of the State. But the Puritans held the Scriptures to be a standard of government and discipline, as well as of doctrine, and that nothing should be imposed as necessary but what was expressly contained in, or derived from, them by necessary consequence; and that if things necessary for the government of the Church could not be deduced from the Scriptures, the discretionary power was not vested in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual officers of the Church. The Court Reformers maintain

that the practice of the primitive church, for the first four or five centuries, was a proper standard of church government and discipline, and, in some respects, better than that of the apostles, which was accommodated to the infant state of the church, whereas this was suited to the grandeur of a national establishment.

But the Puritans were for keeping close to the word of God, in the main principles of church government, and for admitting no church officer, nor ordinances, but such as are appointed therein. They held that the form of government ordained by the apostles was aristocratical, according to the constitution of the Jewish Sanhedrim, and was designed for a pattern to the churches, not to be departed from in any of its main principles; and, therefore, they paid no regard to the customs of early centuries, any further than they corresponded with the Scriptures.

Again the Court Reformers held that things indifferent, in their own nature—neither commanded nor forbidden in the Scriptures—as ceremonies, rites, habits, might be settled, determined, and made necessary by the command of the civil magistrate; and that, in such cases, it was the indispensable duty of subjects to observe them. They thought that ceremonies and habits might be used or not, in the Church; and that if any, those of Rome were to be preferred, because the people were accustomed to them.

But the Puritans insisted that those things which Christ has left indifferent, ought not to be made necessary by human laws, but that we are to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free; and that such rites, ceremonies, and habits as the Queen had ordained and required to be observed as necessary parts of worship were, in point of fact, not indifferent, but that there were many serious considerations which showed that they were unlawful and to be rejected by God's people. They insisted that these things—and particularly the habits—had been abused to idolatry and superstition, and manifestly tended to lead men back to Popery and superstition. The wearing of Popish garments was a great difficulty with the Puritans. They admitted that it was a very small thing whether a minister should dress himself in a particular habit; but they felt that it was not a small matter for

the civil law to make it a great sin if he did not. But in this case, the peculiar and ancient uniform of Popery—the very livery of its servants—was required to be worn by Protestants. They could not see the wisdom of casting away the Pope, yet holding on to his garments as holy relics, and this when these were regarded by the masses of the people as the badges of the Popish faith; also as being consecrated, and, therefore, possessing a mysterious virtue—like holy water—which mystic virtue imparted a sacredness and validity to the acts of the priests who wore them, and that without them the priest could not be sure that the necessary virtue flowed from his acts to make them valid. Knowing that the people held these habits in this estimation, the Puritans believed that the use of them would be to symbolize with anti-Christ—to mislead the people, and give sanction to this false view of their mystic virtue; and therefore they could not deem their use a matter of indifference, and wished to cast them away, with everything pertaining to Pope and Popery. Also, they found no authority for their use in the Scriptures; also, they felt it was unbecoming in a minister of Christ to minister in his name rigged out in the uniform and badges of anti-Christ; and that such habits were inconsistent with the simplicity of the Christian religion; and the Queen, in requiring them to wear these habits, was virtually guilty of usurping the powers of Christ in the Church, who is its sole lawgiver, and has enjoined all things necessary to be observed to the end of the world; and yet has nowhere enjoined habits—and particularly the habits of the man of sin—but has indulged a liberty to his followers, which they are as much bound to maintain as to observe anything which he has commanded. If the Queen may make these things necessary in the service of God which the Scriptures do not make necessary, she may dress up religion as her caprice may suggest, and, acknowledging no limits to her discretion, instead of one ceremony, load it with a hundred. And in addition to the conclusiveness and cogency of their arguments in behalf of what their consciences were pleading for, the Puritans felt all the more deeply on this subject because they had evidence that the Queen was using her power over the Church mainly to gain carnal and wordly ends, and was doing what she did in the way of reformation more from a

desire to secure the quiet and conformity of her papal subjects, than to promote the purity of religion, and bring it back to a pure Scripture standard. They felt that the Queen's exercise of power in these things was purely arbitrary, and, therefore, to be resisted by the servants of God, on the ground that we ought to obey God rather than men. They began to see and feel that subjects owe no obedience where kings and princes have no right to command; and that God himself not only allows, but requires in subjects disobedience to kings, when the edicts of kings contravene the word of God. And John Knox began to maintain the position "that if kings refuse to reform religion, inferior magistrates and the people, being instructed in the truth by their preacher, may lawfully reform within their own bounds, themselves." There were many other points of disagreement between the Court Reformers and the stricter Protestants. But these are sufficient to indicate the nature of them all, and the importance of the principles for which the Puritans were contending. In the above-mentioned things we see what it was that aroused their minds and consciences, and what caused to spring up in that day the grand debate which drew after it, and into it, the great questions of the limits of civil and ecclesiastical power, and of religious freedom—a debate in which the Court Reformers were so fairly, yet so manifestly beaten in the argument. But when vanquished in the argument, the Queen and her Reformers had other resources upon which to fall back—power was on their side; and, therefore, the Reformation was settled upon the principles of the Court party, and they carried out their views and measures with decision of purpose and great rigor of execution—going even beyond the authority of the laws enacted in their favor, and inflicting censures, fines, imprisonments, and inquisitorial oaths, to such degree as wrung the heart of the nation in pain and affliction, and wore out the patience of the saints of the Most High.

When Scripture argument failed to influence the Queen and her Court party, the Puritans petitioned for indulgence—protesting loyalty to the Queen and the civil laws—but asking not to be required, upon pain of civil penalties, to observe in the worship of God things which, in their candid view, were sinful. But their petition was rejected; and the Queen and

Court Reformers took the ground that the Puritans should not be allowed to think for themselves as to matters of the Queen's prerogative, and the rites and ceremonies which she had ordained; also, they required the Puritans to confess under oath that her claims of spiritual power, and everything in the prayer-book, and her injunctions, were agreeable to the word of God, and such as refused to make the confession were deprived of place and license, and thrown into prison. These rigors caused ministers and people to forsake their parish churches, and meet in private places for God's worship. The Queen attempted to compel their attendance at the parish churches, by fines and imprisonments. But they denied the authority of the civil power to command in such things, and insisted that a superior regard was due to the word of God above what was due to the will of the Queen in these things. Parliament interposed, and made efforts to give relief to the Puritans by law. This alarmed the Bishops and offended the Queen, and caused her to strain her prerogative and strike a blow at the freedom of Parliament. "Many of its members were aroused by her course—had a brave spirit of liberty awakened in them, and many free speeches were made." But the Queen triumphed—carried things her way—and sent these speakers to the Tower. Though the hearty sympathies of the House of Commons was with the Puritans, the Queen and Court party held the power through the upper House, and prevented legislation contrary to their views, and made the Puritans suffer the full extremity of the legal penalties for non-conformity. But these severities against men of pious and holy lives raised the compassion of the great mass of the common people, and brought them over to the interests of these persecuted men, and led them to resort to their prisons, and, standing in the streets, hear them preach the Gospel through prison bolts and bars, and many people of rank encouraged them in it. The more stringently the Queen had the penalties of non-conformity inflicted, the more did the people of all ranks sympathize with them and espouse their cause, until the Queen was made to realize that the hearts of her subjects were becoming alienated from her. And, though much chagrined and mortified over this fact, she relaxed nothing and conceded nothing to her Puritan subjects, and asserted

and exercised all her high powers in the Church to the last. She was nothing deterred nor diverted from her purpose to keep the Church in subserviency to her will and pleasure, by the way the Lord oftentimes and so manifestly turned her hands against herself, and made her stringent measures for enforcing conformity signally efficacious in defeating her aim, and in increasing the numbers and influence of the party whom she was laboring to extinguish. Though her efforts to coerce conformity did but have the effect to drive the Puritans to the establishing of separate communions, and to extend prophesyings over the country, and increase Scriptural knowledge among the people, and establish private presbyteries and assemblies for the recovering of the discipline of the Church to a more primitive standard, she never swerved from her purpose, and in the face of the great and decided revolution which was rapidly progressing in the knowledge and sentiments of her people, "she refused to permit prophesyings and assemblies for reading the Scriptures, and all things else tending to invite free inquiry after truth—being of opinion that knowledge and learning in the laity would only endanger their peaceable submission to her absolute will and pleasure.

(To be Continued.)

ART. VI.—*The True Mission of the Church.**

GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND BRETHREN OF
THE SYNOD:

ON entering, in this formal manner, upon the duties of the office to which I have been appointed, under the sanctions of the writing which I have subscribed in your presence, I may

*This article is an inaugural address, delivered in Paris, Kentucky, May 2, 1863, before the Synod of Kentucky and the Board of Directors of Danville Theological Seminary, on the induction of the author into the office of Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology in that institution.

be allowed to say that this is one of the most solemn moments of my life. To be called to take part in instructing the rising ministry of the Gospel, to be called to this work by the supreme judicatory of the Church, and to assume the obligations which such a position imposes at a time when the overturnings among the kingdoms of the earth betoken the near approach of the Son of Man with power and great glory, serve to invest the occasion on which we are assembled with peculiar interest to me; and in all this I doubt not I but share the sympathies of this venerable synod, in the bosom of which the General Assembly has established one of the seminaries of the Church, for whose prosperity your prayers, and labors, and contributions have been so well and so freely bestowed.

The department of instruction assigned to me in this seminary—that of Church Government and Pastoral Theology—comprehends what more immediately enters into the current experience and duties of the Church in the actual and constant working out, in real life, of Jehovah's grand designs of mercy for men. From this stand-point it has been termed the department of Applied Theology, to which the Exegetical, the Dogmatic, and the Historical look forward, in a measure, as their end. In this view, nothing can be more important than the general subject-matter which this department embraces, nor more weighty than the responsibility which it imposes. To attempt the work of instructing those who are to become instructors of the people; in the preaching of the Gospel, both in the matter and manner of the service, and in conducting all parts of the worship of the Lord's house, so as to fulfill his gracious designs of saving, out of all people, his own chosen ones, and holding forth "this Gospel of the kingdom in all the world for a witness unto all nations;" in the pastoral watch and care of the Church, composed of imperfect, erring men, in the midst of an ungodly world, so as to preserve "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," reaching the salutary ends of all discipline in the edification of true believers and the severance of the profane and reprobate; and in the exercise of the functions of government in all the courts of the Church, from the parochial through the presbyterial and synodical up to the general assembly of the whole body, so as to promote love and concord, and the preventing or healing of schism,

and maintain the body of Christ intact "in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God," in order "that they all may be one," and that thereby "the world may know," as Christ declares they should, that he is sent of the Father, and that his Church bears a testimony to which all men should give heed; all this is a work which no man should covet, and from which any one may justly shrink. In undertaking this work, at the call of the General Assembly, I can only cast myself upon the indulgence of my brethren and upon the grace of God.

General custom, as well as the manifest proprieties of the case, suggest that I should engage your attention with some theme connected more especially with the department committed to my care. Dr. Blair, in his elaborate work on rhetoric, when classifying the several kinds of public speaking with reference to their object, puts down "inaugural orations" in the category of those "which aim only at pleasing the hearers." But in such a service and in such a presence as this, something higher should be attempted. If my aim be not to instruct these venerable fathers and brethren—with whom, for such a purpose, we might well change places—the occasion on which we are convened may justly lead us all into regions of contemplation, and to communion upon themes which have a far nobler aim than to afford a momentary pleasure.

If the Scriptures are a revelation from God, no duties which are imposed upon men are more solemn in their execution, more glorious or awful in their results, and, at the same time, none may be discharged with a more cheerful spirit and bring a higher reward, than those which fall to the lot of the ministers of Christ. They are the gatherers, the guardians, the instructors of his blood-bought Church. And as no other society on earth, nor all mankind besides, can bear any comparison with this spiritual body for importance in the world or to the world, as doing even the generations of the ungodly unspeakable good; and as nothing else which God has made or done in all the eternity of the past, so far as revealed to us, for setting forth his glory, either among men or before the principalities and powers above, may vie with what he is unfolding through the successive ages of his Church, and will consummate in the end; so the true body of Christ, in all its

individual members, and so all the ministers of this body, and all the divinely-appointed ordinances and institutions of the Church, for carrying forward the glorious purposes of God, hold a place among men and before heaven infinitely above all other interests in which any part of his universe is concerned.

Under inspirations so lofty and soul-stirring, let us devote the passing hour to some reflections upon *the true mission of the Church.*

There is a wide field for discussion still open upon many topics which come appropriately within this department of seminary instruction, and which underlie all that belongs to it. Concerning some of the most vital of these, the faith of the Church is not yet settled. Even within our own denomination, not only among her people and her ministers, but among those whom the supreme judicatory of the common body has selected to teach in her seminaries, these differences are found to exist, and they involve matters of great moment. Among them are questions which relate to the nature and attributes of the Church; to its powers within and for itself; to its relations to the state and to the world at large; to some of its officers, with the nature and extent of their functions; and even the naked question, What is the Church? would be answered very differently by eminent men in our own communion, who have made the subjects appertaining to its solution a life-long study. These, and others of a kindred character, have entered into the elaborate discussions many years past; and, from present indications, these discussions will continue for an indefinite time to come. On this occasion, however, we choose to pass all these topics by, as better suited to the lecture-room, or to a more thorough handling than our time will admit; and we wish at present to look directly at the theme we have named, as one of interest, importance and great practical concern. It is, indeed, quite palpable to every one, that we can not justly entertain or exhibit what belongs to the true mission of the Church, without understanding its true nature, attributes, powers, offices, relations, prerogatives, and whatever else may enter into the simple question, What is the Church? But there is, for our present purpose, a sufficiently definite apprehension in the popular mind as to the

real character of that body among men, distinct from all other organizations—which we call the *Church of Christ*—to warrant our coming directly to the question of its true mission in the world. To this simple topic let us then give our present attention.

We shall not be deemed guilty of transcending the limits of truth, nor of irreverence toward God, in declaring that, so far as known to men, redemption is the grandest conception of the Deity. The establishment of such a proposition would show at once the exalted character of the mission of the Church. It calls, however, for no elaborate and formal proof, though we may barely notice some of the points involved. We assume as a postulate in revealed theology, that the glory of God is the end of all things: "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen." While this is undeniable, it is nowhere asserted in the Scriptures that it is the design of the present scheme of things to secure the highest absolute glory of God. What may compass that grand problem we do not know, for God has not told us. It may be true that the highest absolute glory of God is designed, and if so, it will infallibly be reached through what is now transpiring; or this consummation may be reserved for something yet to come, not opened to our knowledge. We certainly may not conclude, without definite authority, that the resources of the Deity, in the line of the divine glory, are exhausted in what the present system of things contemplates, and therefore that this is the system above all other possible modes for reaching the highest point in the proposed end. If God is infinite in his nature, and is from eternity to eternity, our lips must be dumb as to what he can and may do, touching all things which lie beyond the line of his own specific revelations. Of this, however, we are certain, that all things belonging to the present system of the universe do actually promote the glory of God. It was from the beginning, and is now, his purpose that they should, and this purpose is infallibly secured. This is true of unconscious matter and of conscious mind; of all the physical worlds, and of all their tribes from the insect to the archangel; of holy and obedient subjects on earth and in heaven, and of the wicked among men and devils; of sin and of righteous-

ness, as attributes of character, and all the influences and fruits which result from them. In the very widest sense, all things are for the glory of God. It by no means follows that all things promote God's glory in the same way, nor in an equal degree, much less that God approves with complacency all that occurs. This would be to annihilate distinctions which are clearly announced in the Scriptures, and which also are as palpable to the human mind as anything within its knowledge. But it is, nevertheless, the prerogative of God to cause all things to promote his glory. This prerogative he does actually exercise, and the result is, therefore, infallibly secured through the present system of things, whatever may indeed be the measure of the glory which, in this manner, he has proposed to himself.

While the Scriptures thus plainly declare God's glory to be the end of all things, it must be equally clear, even to the human reason, that nothing can so highly conduce to this end as the display of his own perfections. This must be the case whatever the circumstances of the exhibition may be. If we contemplate God as existing from eternity, before the exercise of creative power, he can present to himself alone no higher glory than himself. If we behold him bringing into existence successive orders of rational creatures with the purpose of showing unto them his glory, endowed with powers adequate to appreciating it, still he can display it in no higher manner than by the unfolding before them of his own perfections. It is no doubt true, that with the same end in view he may choose another mode, and show his glory in a subordinate degree; but the highest attainable display must be in the exhibition of the characteristics of his infinite nature. And even here, the degree in which his glory will be actually displayed, will be measured by the extent of the unfoldings of his varied perfections which he may choose to make; and the degree in which this exhibition will be appreciated by his rational creatures, will depend upon their capacities and opportunities, and their proper improvement of them.

It seems, furthermore, to be perfectly clear, from the whole scope of the Scriptures, that redemption more gloriously unfolds the divine perfections than anything else known to men. And that it is the measure for the highest manifestation

of the divine perfections known even to the angels, there is much ground for believing. We are warranted, therefore, in declaring, not only so far as known to men, but probably to the highest order of created beings also, that redemption, to accomplish which on earth the church has been organized, is the grandest conception of the Deity. And, indeed, it may be—there are at least shadowings of the truth in this direction—that redemption, in its eternal purpose, subsequent development, ceaseless progress, and final consummation, is now, and is designed to be through all the cycles of a coming eternity, the scheme with which nothing shall compare, to set forth before all creatures, in the display of his boundless perfections, the very highest absolute glory of God. The place which the Scriptures give it, among all the purposes and counsels of the Godhead, appears, with much good reason, to warrant this conclusion. Hence, we are assured that, as a manifestation of God, of his attributes, character, works, and government, redemption embraces in its plan, in its objects, and in its agents, all worlds and all beings. The entire universe, with all it contains, was created and is ruled only to subserve its ends. Angels and demons are its agents. Wicked men and good men promote it. It includes the whole of providence, universal and particular. This extends to all worlds and all creatures; to all thoughts, purposes, and actions of rational beings, and to all events of the physical creation. All these God controls and directs with absolute certainty, and they are all made to contribute to the grand purpose. In the prosecution of redemption, there are exhibited characteristics of the Deity not in any other manner displayed to human, and probably not to angelic, knowledge, while those otherwise known are here made to shine forth more brightly. Mercy, grace, compassion, long-suffering, have no such display anywhere else. Though such perfections belong to God's nature as truly as any others, yet, so far as we know, they have no scope for a full and actual exhibition, except in redemption; and undoubtedly they make a far deeper impression on the higher orders of rational beings from the circumstances under which they are illustrated, and from the results which follow, than could be secured in any other way. This is evident from their irrepressible desire to look further into these deep mysteries. So,

on the other hand, those perfections which stand opposite to these, as justice and wrath, are more strikingly seen in the events which occur in the prosecution of this plan than they otherwise could be, and their true nature and real necessity as elements of government are far better understood. And what is most wonderful of all is the fact that, in the manifold wisdom of God, redemption is the only measure known wherein we see these apparently conflicting attributes working together in perfect harmony, showing God to be at the same moment infinitely merciful and infinitely just; thus baffling forever the boastings of human reason, vindicating God's ways to men, shutting the lips of gainsayers, and setting upon the Scriptures, in which these amazing unfoldings are found, the true signet of the King of kings. And we see, also, that all the fundamental elements of the divine government, running through its entire administration over any beings, are more boldly brought out in redemption than anywhere else. Law, as an element of government, stands out here in greater prominence by reason of its connection with grace. It is maintained, magnified, and made honorable by Christ, as it could not be by men or angels. Its righteousness is seen in the Redeemer's obedience more brightly, and its penalty in his death more fearfully, than the one could be seen in the fidelity, or the other in the eternal perdition, of all God's creatures. So, also, sin appears more malignant and hell-deserving in the light of the Redeemer's cross, than in all other punishments actual and possible. And there are peculiar beauties in holiness, under the Gospel economy of grace, which we may look for in vain under any mere dispensation of law.

And now, if we rise from a contemplation of these features of the divine character and administration to the actual concern in redemption, taken by the great administrator, we find that it engages the supreme interest and energies of the Godhead. It is the sum of the divine counsels from eternity, and the end of all dispensations. The Father has committed its execution to his only-begotten and well-loved Son. To accomplish it, God become incarnate—the great “mystery of Godliness!” The Father has given to the Son “all power in heaven and in earth,” and for the time has put the government of the whole universe into his hands. The Son is “God

with us;" "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person;" "Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Having come in "the fullness of time," and having suffered, risen, ascended, and entered upon his dominion, all the power of his Deity, all the sympathies of his humanity, and all the resources of his vast empire, are now given to the execution of redemption. The third person in the Trinity performs a part in the great scheme, equally necessary and important. So far as God's chosen people are concerned, the Holy Spirit makes actually effective the purpose of the Father and work of the Son, by applying to them the redemption purchased by Christ. By his regenerating grace he brings each one to take his true position in the redeemed family of God; and there, through the means of his sanctifying grace, they are all "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." Beyond this, through the force of his divine truth, the Holy Spirit "reproves the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."

It thus plainly appears how it is that redemption so highly displays the divine glory. It embraces all worlds, beings, counsels, works, and providences, from eternity to eternity. It exhibits God in the fullness of his attributes and administration over all. It supremely engages all the persons of the Godhead in its plans and their execution. And in each and all these features, it stands forth in matchless grandeur, infinitely above all else we know of a wonder-working God!

At this point, we see the direct bearing of the whole upon the mission of the Church. The plan of redemption is wrought out before the eyes of a wondering universe upon our earth and among our race. Of the two orders of fallen beings, men only are redeemed. The Son of God took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham. In this nature, he taught, obeyed, wrought his mighty works, and atoned for sin. In this nature, he arose, ascended, and reigns. In this nature, he will come the second time without sin unto salvation. In this nature, he will judge the world. All that Christ did upon earth and is doing in heaven, all that the Father's counsels contemplated, and all that the Spirit's work accomplishes, is directly for man. He alone, as a sinner, is redeemed. Other orders of beings are deeply interested, and may be in some way directly blessed by

redemption, but man is the sole recipient of saving grace. It is thus upon this earth and among the race of Adam that this grandest of divine conceptions for the display of the divine glory has its chief accomplishment. And it is just here that we behold the dignity, the importance, and the true design, of the Church. It is to carry out, by and through the Church, this great scheme of grace, for the illustration of Jehovah's glory, that the Church has been gathered and organized. Its true and specific mission, therefore, in due subordination to the divine purpose which controls the whole, is to gather the Lord's elect out of all nations from age to age, to perfect the body of Christ, and to hold forth before all people the truth and ordinances of God as a living testimony to his condescension to the children of men, and for a swift witness against all the workers of iniquity. The Church is thus the divinely-appointed instructor of all people in the entire revealed will of God. It must declare "all the counsel of God," unfolding and enforcing every duty arising out of every position filled by men, and reaching to every relationship of life; and it must delineate and denounce all infractions of the divine law, and all neglect or frustration of the Gospel of grace; the sole object in all being to promote the glory of God, both through the salvation of all who hear the Church, and through the condemnation of all who turn a deaf ear to her voice.

That such is the mission of the Church is not more clearly revealed than is the real character of the body itself, and the definite manner in which it is to execute its mission. God has authoritatively determined and declared the whole. He has plainly drawn the portraiture of the Church, as a divine organization, under One Glorious Head, the Lord Jesus Christ; defined the characteristics of its members, and set forth their duties, privileges, trials, and rewards; declared the number, name, qualifications, and functions of its officers, and how the body shall be perpetuated and extended from age to age; instituted its ordinances, for its own edification and for the instruction and warning of the world without; and directed the Church in its whole duty, as an organized body, respecting the measures through which it is to fulfill its mission among men, in the constant enlargement of its own spiritual boundaries, and in carrying the Gospel in the true missionary

spirit of Christ and his apostles to all the tribes of the earth. What God has thus revealed touching all these points, the Church must fulfill. Beyond this she has no mission, for beyond this she has no authority. Whatever may be essential in the circumstances of her own condition or in the state of the world, to enable her to exercise the specific grant of her power, or to discharge the full measure of her duty within the stipulations of her authority, is, from the necessities of the case, left to her wisdom and discretion, seeking counsel of God. Beyond this, and even within this, she is shut up to the directions of his revealed will.

It is another clear principle of revelation, that the Church of Christ is the sole organization among mankind for effecting the high purpose of illustrating, in this peculiar manner, the glory of God. It is to accomplish its mission, efficiently yet solely, under grace, through the specific means of God's appointment. The great power in its hands is revealed truth. Its chief manner of employing it is by the ministry of reconciliation, in the preaching of the Word, and through the sacraments and services of the Lord's house. As the ministry is a chief instrumentality, in order to meet the ever-increasing wants of the Church as she enlarges her boundaries, and to meet the demands of a perishing world, a special work of the Church, than which there is none of higher importance and necessity, is the training up of a ministry. Without this, no purpose of the Church's existence can be secured. Seal the lips of the ministry, annihilate the order, and the sanctuary would be closed, the Sabbath soon forgotten, the people go untaught, and the Church and the world would perish together. Christ's presence in the Church, through all its ordinances, is a real and constant presence, by his Spirit. Without it these ordinances are vain; with it they are life and power. But in the economy of grace which God in wisdom has established, the living ministry is an essential and chief element in the realization of this power. Without it, Christ's presence would not be given any more than without the truth, or the sacraments, or ordinary worship. And beyond all this—such is man—Christ's presence could not be made effectual without the living teacher, but upon a change either of the nature of man, or of the whole Gospel economy.

It is not more true that "we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us," than it is that this feature of the plan of grace is essential as a bond of sympathy between the glorified and unseen Saviour and his people. Hence the absolute necessity of the ministry. Now, is it merely a living ministry that is demanded, but a ministry of flesh and blood, a ministry in the body, a ministry of the same race. The ministry of angels would not answer the end. It must be a ministry of man, as it is a ministry to man and for man. This is a prime and radical element of this economy. And while, on the one hand, the Church may here behold one of the richest gifts of her inheritance from her ascended Lord, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ;" so, on the other hand, the Church may here learn one of the plainest and most important of the duties which her divine Head has imposed upon her. It is to train up and send forth this ministry of reconciliation. This involves parental consecration of children to this work; their proper education; the endowment and support of institutions for the professional training of the ministry; funds for the maintenance of candidates who may need aid; and all else which the wisdom of the Church, developed from age to age, under the providence of God, shows to be necessary. We are well assured, from Scripture, from the experience of the Church, from her whole history, and from her present necessities, that those who are blessed with this world's goods, be it little or much, can not do a better service for the Lord with their worldly substance, than to bestow it upon institutions for a wise training of the Gospel ministry; and their liberality in this regard should be proportioned to the greatness of the work which the Church has to do, under the pressing calls of her many waste places, and the demands of the world at home and abroad.

If the position we have taken be correct, that so far as man's knowledge extends, redemption is the grandest conception of the Deity, it is evident that the mission of the Church is the noblest which can engage any beings. The truth it

teaches eclipses all other knowledge; its sacraments surpass all other memorials; its worship engages higher faculties and aspirations than any other possessed by men; its objects contemplate infinitely more, even for humanity alone, for this world as well as the next, than the highest or even all schemes of benevolence and philanthropy; it carries with all its measures a divine power which touches the springs of moral being, and directs all the after-life of man; its destiny is to ameliorate, and finally to remove, all the evils of this world, and make it a paradise of God; its people are the elect of God, the hidden ones, the chosen from eternity, the princes of the race, the priests of God, the Lord's peculiar treasure; the ultimate aim and end of all its labors, its sacrifices, and its sufferings, is to secure the eternal redemption of all the Lord's people, and contribute to the highest glory of the Godhead! What a mission, what a work, what a destiny, what an honor, what a glory, has the Lord placed before his Church!

The ministry, to whom is committed the duty of leading in this career of the Church, is, by virtue of the considerations just mentioned, the most honored and responsible body among men. We say this, not in self-adulation of our order, but with a due sense of what God has declared, and in the spirit of the apostle who said, "I magnify mine office." If, then, the mission of the Church is here rightly viewed, how great must be the obligations which rest upon the ministry, and how pressing the need of its increase, that it may keep pace with the demands of the Church and the world. With what earnest inquiry as to the cause and remedy, should the fact be pondered, which was stated before our last General Assembly, in the report upon the Board of Education, that "there has been an actual decrease of the ministry as compared with the membership of our church, of at least five per centum within the last ten years." According to this, the ministry has not even kept pace with the Church, to say nothing of the increasing wants of our country from a rapid increase of population, and the still greater demands of the world at large; and this, too, covering a period within which there have been more marked and general outpourings of the Spirit upon the churches than during any given period of equal length in our church's history. And how shall this be explained?

Have the allurements of wealth and honor from the wonderful prosperity of our country been so great that parents have withheld their sons from the Lord's work, and that the vast body of our pious young men have too willingly turned their backs upon the ministry? Ah! God has laid his heavy hand upon their idols, and thousands of the Church's young men have been swept into the army, and multitudes of them have gone forward to give their account to God, leaving desolated households to mourn their untimely death! This actual decrease of the ministry, already so great, and the probability that the war may lessen the number of candidates for years to come, should most seriously engage the inquiries, the prayers, and the labors of the Church, that she may know, if possible, why God is thus crippling her in this most vital element of her power, and that she may do what in her lies to remedy this evil, in order that she fail not utterly in her mission for our country and for the world.

Having thus taken a view of the mission of the Church as an organization for promoting the great end of all things—God's true glory in the universe—and especially his glory in the spiritual welfare of men, let us, in the remainder of this address, ask your attention to two things, as collateral and subordinate to the specific ordinances of the Gospel, which the Church may legitimately employ, and which she is, to some extent, already employing, to render more efficient these ordinances, and thus the better promote the direct objects of her mission. Guided by the providence of God, which sets before us the aspects of the real world in which, and upon which, the Church is to operate, we hesitate not to say that, in the execution of her work, the Church should lay her hand, as far as she justly may, upon all the controlling agencies of society. They belong to her of right. They have been given to her of God. We name but two as examples.

The Church should control the educational institutions of the world—male and female—from the primary school up through all grades to the college and university. We do not mean that the Church should absolutely possess all these in her organic character, and manage them through her courts. Nor do we mean, especially, that the Church should take the work of common school education out of the hands of the

State, where it properly belongs, and on which, as we hold, rests an imperious necessity, consulting the State's own highest civil and social welfare alone, to say no more, to give a good common school education to all the youth of the land. Nor should the Church improperly interfere with or hinder, much less oppose, the State's proper work in this sphere? But yet, in the exercise of her legitimate functions, the power of the Church should be felt, through her people and her ministers, and in coöperation with all who are like-minded, in shaping aright all State schools, and those of every other description, so that, at the very least, they may be preserved from irreligious tendencies, and may be imbued with a reverence for God's word, and thus become auxiliary to, and not contribute to oppose, the proper work of the Church. When we speak of the control which the Church should thus exercise, we have reference to no particular denomination; we mean Christ's true body, the Evangelical Church at large. The Presbyterian Church, as all the world knows, has been in all countries a leader in the work of education, and long may she wear this wreath of honor. Least of all should she relax her efforts in this day, so marked by the growth of schools and the spread of knowledge, and especially when some of these fountains of influence send forth streams of demoralization and death.

But beyond this sort of watchfulness over schools which are without her pale, why should not the Church—our own Church—have schools of every grade, and for both sexes, directly under her authority—primary schools and academies under her presbyteries, and colleges under her synods? Can she fulfill her duty even to her own children without this? Can she, without this, meet the full demands of her mission in aiding to evangelize the world. If we are not too wise to apply the adage, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*, we have but to look at the Church of Rome for an example. Her power in this Protestant land, and a power exerted in a way which will tell in the future more than in the present, is a power gained largely through her schools. When we shall emulate her diligence in this department, our influence as a church, in the line of our true evangelical mission, will be increased many fold. We can perceive nothing which would tend to lead the Church

away from her strictly evangelical work, but much every way to promote it, if she should give her energies to build up and endow educational institutions of all grades, man them with teachers of her own communion, mark out for them courses of study which would secure, along with all branches of worldly science, an acquaintance with God's word, and that system of its great truths recognized in our standards, and require reports to be annually made directly to the courts of the Church, or to boards appointed by and amenable to them, imposing thus a responsibility which would give the Church an absolute control, and secure the great end in view. It is a mistaken notion to suppose that such a system would drive away from these institutions all but the Church's own children. On the contrary, while it would be of incalculable benefit to them, saving them from snares to which they are now exposed, the high reputation which the Presbyterian Church has always enjoyed for securing thorough training, would attach to her schools the youth of all classes and creeds. This system has, to a limited extent, been already adopted in our church, and it has been substantially recommended by several General Assemblies. Our wish is that it may become universal. If there is benefit in the system, it should be afforded to all. If there is a demand for it, no period of the world has more imperiously shown it than the present.

In how many of the higher schools of our country are many branches of science so taught and pursued as directly to work into the hands of a popular and God-defying infidelity; while, as to anything which bears the name of religion taught in them, it is but a negation of all positive belief of anything in heaven or upon earth, or a direct inculcation of disbelief in many vital things which are distinctive of Christianity. How many sons of the families of our own communion are sent to such schools, because of their princely endowments, able faculties, numerous libraries, extensive cabinets, and philosophical apparatus, and all the other appliances needful to furnishing the most enlarged facilities for pursuing all branches of knowledge; and how many of these youth come away with biases against the religion of their fathers, or with the seeds of death planted in their souls. These things are known and read of all men. The arch-enemy of the truth works here

with powerful skill and success. Fortunes are still bestowed upon these schools, at a single dash of the pen, securing to them a higher power for evil. With such examples before us, the question is whether the Church has not here a duty to perform, beyond any efforts which she has yet made. Upon the principle we hold, that the Church may and should deal with all matters which vitally affect the morals and spirituality of the world, her duty is clear. The manner of her performing it is no less plain. The Church must meet the enemy upon his own ground. Our church must either renounce her well-earned reputation, fall back from being a leader in the work of education, and a patron of institutions for the highest attainments in knowledge, ignore the existence of a power laying waste her own heritage, and abandon many of her own children, during the forming period of their character, to all the subtleties of these institutions of the devil; or, she must build up competing institutions, with all the enlarged and munificent facilities furnished by them. She is shut up to this alternative. That she may properly do this work, and that she can and should do it, we think unquestionable. Only let her ministry, her eldership, and her members acknowledge its necessity, and the work is already well advanced. She has the means, and can command the men. All that is needed is to be convinced of the duty, and awakened to a sense of its importance, and then Christian men will act in the fear of God.

There is one consideration which should not be overlooked in this connection, showing that the Church should not be satisfied with a standard which might do for other days. The developments, or, if you prefer, the pretensions, of modern science, as received from many of its devotees, lay claim to wonderful discoveries and great advancement beyond any former age; and some of them directly conflict with revelation. We must of necessity follow, somewhat, in the paths which have thus been opened, whether they lead to error or to truth. We must enter that we may detect and appropriate the truth, or that we may expose and warn against the error. This burden is laid upon us. We must take it up and bear it forward, or fall behind in this day of amazing activity and progress. An example or two will show what we mean.

The world-renowned Humboldt, honored by courts and courted by kings as the great high priest of science, after having dwelt upon this earth for some ninety or more years, and traveled extensively over it, and beheld and studied its phenomena which so plainly give testimony everywhere to a Divine architect—sweeping with his comprehensive powers those fields of unmeasured space, where

The Heavens declare the glory of God,
And the firmament sheweth his handiwork;
Day unto day uttereth speech,
And night unto night sheweth knowledge:

—writes his *Cosmos* in his old age (yet in the full vigor of all his faculties), as the sum of all his researches in science, in which he makes a world without a God! Sir Charles Lyell, in his geological observations upon the Antiquity of Man, just issued from the press, in which he gives a *resume* of all the geological facts and deductions bearing on the question, overturns at a single dash all the foundations of Biblical Chronology, places the origin of man on the earth ages prior to the Scriptural account, and thus would quietly upset our faith in the whole system of revealed truth. Agassiz, while consoling conceited Americans with the geological announcement that ours is the Old World, artfully distills the skepticism of the New through his able writings on natural history, possessing all the characteristic subtleness of the French schools of infidelity. In his zeal to maintain a theory, he hesitates not to degrade man to the level of a mere animal, positively “objects to the admission of a distinct kingdom for man alone,” and argues against “a community of origin” for the human race; and the result of his reasonings is to strike down at a blow some of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian system, and destroy the Gospel plan of salvation. And Buckle, another popular orator upon science and civilization, and a true disciple of Comte, adds a powerful ingredient to the potion by which the public mind is poisoned, in the cool and confident assertion, that “religion is on the increase in the world, but theology is declining,” as though there could be true religion without theology; and that “there is no doctrine or truth in Christianity that had not been announced before! And to put the finishing touch to these amazing strides of

what the popular mind drinks in as the profoundest learning, the recent British essayists, holding high places in the English church, and filling chairs in the English universities, some of them wearing the miter and wielding the crosier, boldly maintain that "all cultivated minds regard the religious basis of orthodoxy as no longer tenable, and demand a new reformation which shall bring religion and the Church into harmony with reason."

Such is a specimen of the teachings, from the very highest authorities, which our youth are to meet in the lecture-rooms of our halls of learning, and which, at the hands of many who follow these masters, so greatly infest the highways of literature and science. That the world "does move," is thus clear; but whether in the wrong or right direction, it is ours, if possible, to know, that we may meet the assaults of an ever-shifting skepticism, and save those whom God has committed to our watch and culture. It is essential to a decent self-defense, and essential to our doing our full share in bringing the world to Christ.

It can admit of no manner of doubt, that the proper training of youth, and especially the youth of the Church—the children of the covenant—is among the most important works of the Church's mission. Her present security, her future increase, her prospective power, her ultimate success in all that God has given her to do, depend, in a large measure, upon the attention she may give to the lambs of the flock. And it is because all this is true, and fraught with results so momentous and imperishable, that we would urge the Church to lay her hand to this work, in the way here mentioned. We are well aware that, in order that any right incipient direction may be given, and that any success may result, we must look back to the household as the fountain of all good that is to flow forth. Here God has placed the primary responsibility. It is lodged in the hands of parents and in the bosom of the family. A right beginning made here is full of promise. But how are parents' hopes to be realized, their prayers to be answered, and God's full promise to them to be made good, unless the Church furnish the proper schools into which the child may step when he leaves the parental roof, and through all grades of which he may pass, until the highest attainments in educa-

tion shall be made? Shall he be abandoned by the Church as soon as the parent must dismiss him, and at that most critical of all periods of his life, be given over to schools under the control of the devil? If it be once admitted that the training of her children and youth for the Kingdom of God is a prime duty of the Church, we do not see how it can be fulfilled, unless the Church furnish the means of education to the full extent to which it is deemed desirable or necessary in fulfillment of her duty, that their education shall be carried. If that stage can be reached in the primary school, give them that. If a collegiate course be deemed essential to the position which we would have them take in life, provide that. If we think it well that our Christian youth—the hope of the Church, of our country, and of mankind—should be able, whether they enter the ministry or not, to take rank with any that walk the earth, in attainments in all true science and every branch of knowledge that may be mastered in any of the schools of the world, while, at the same time, they shall in these pursuits be preserved from making shipwreck of an evangelical faith, and come forth and show themselves able in after-life, in conflict with the princes in science, to vindicate the ways of God to men; then let the Church, if she would bring this power upon herself and to her Lord, through her sons, provide, under her own control, the means of this high attainment. She may do it if she will. We well know that the universities of Europe, and some of the older institutions of our own country, afford certain facilities with which there is no competition, and which constitute their great attraction. But must this always be so? It will be if we will it, and yet it will not be if we will it. We would have the Church lay these broad foundations, and rear these noble superstructures, and write upon them from foundation to topstone, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men!" We would have her thus show to all the world that she has a high regard for her sons and daughters, and a deep concern for the honor of her Saviour, and that there is some better disposition of her wealth than to hoard it up for the ruin of her children.

In carrying out such a system to the highest point attainable, it is not essential that new institutions, in all cases, should

be founded, but that those now on the proper foundation should have their facilities enlarged. In this goodly commonwealth, what hinders making the college of this synod, in due time, equal in all respects to the oldest and highest universities of our own or of any land, but the will of God's people? And what hinders the development of such an interest among the people as shall bring that will to a right decision and to a vigorous action, but proper views to be entertained by the ministry? As to the money needed for this, we should not look to the wealthy alone, nor to the legacies of the dead, but to contributions from every living member of the church. This is the true principle in all the work of the Church. Men and women and children should be taught to "do up their charities," if they choose thus to phrase it, during their lifetime, and through all periods of their life, daily, constantly. Let this doctrine be inculcated from all our pulpits, and sustained by all our courts, and there would be no lack in the Lord's treasury for any of the enterprises of the Church, educational or evangelical.

It is as clear as the light at noonday, that the great battle which Christianity is to fight with infidelity in this age—a contest already waxing hot in some places—is, in part, a battle with what passes under the name of science, and, in part, a battle with that species of scholarship which openly attacks the inspiration and genuineness of the Scriptures. We would, by no means, depreciate the progress which is being made, in our day, in every species of knowledge. We fully concede that science is advancing more rapidly than ever before known, and that no previous time can compare with the present for the ability and learning brought to the study of the Scriptures. But with all this, there is much which passes under these specious terms, which will be found in the end not to bear examination. What we would have the Church do is to meet promptly the demand which such a state of things creates and suggests. If she will not add to our college curriculum what is necessary (or even if she should), let her add to that of her theological seminaries, and, if need be, establish a separate department in each, whose specialty shall be to instruct in the true relations between science and revelation, in order that our young men, who

are to enter the ministry, may be well grounded in those aspects of truth which are now making up the living issues of the times, and which may continue for a long period to come.

But without further pursuing this important and suggestive theme, we leave it with stating the obvious conviction which must possess every enlightened judgment, that the Church is far behind the proper standard of her duty in this whole business of training her children and young men for the work and glory of her Lord. This conviction every one must share who but looks at the actual condition of society in our day, and justly regards the mission which the Church is given to perform for its highest welfare.

There is another educating power in one of the mightiest engines extant for controlling society, on which the Church should lay her hand to a greater extent than she now essays to do. It is that of the press. No one can say that her using it directly is beyond her legitimate province and duty. That point has already been settled by the Church herself in a way which puts her judgment beyond doubt. She admits its power and her duty to use it, as seen in some of her own organic agencies. Her Boards of Publication, her Tract Societies, her Book Concerns, and her systems of Colportage, to spread broadcast an evangelical literature, furnish the evidence. We, therefore, advocate nothing new. It is true, these institutions are but of recent origin. Two generations ago the Church knew nothing of them. They have arisen from the necessities of the case. They are the product of the present age, developed from its special characteristics and marked tendencies. The Church has established them, partly in self-defense against a corrupting popular literature, and partly to augment her aggressive power over the world. In this she has shown eminent wisdom. They are now an acknowledged agency, with which she could not dispense. When inaugurated, prejudices were raised against them. They were an innovation upon the usages of the Church, and unknown to the fathers. In later days objections on other grounds have been raised, and vehemently urged in our highest courts. But the Church has outlived them all. Like theological seminaries, which are also comparatively recent,

the whole Church is now agreed in their necessity. Our Board of Publication takes rank with all our other Boards, is one member of our organic system, and comes annually before the General Assembly to report what it has done in the name and by the authority of the whole Church, to diffuse abroad the truth in a popular form by means of the press. Here is wisdom. Here is progress. But has the Church done all that she may properly do through this potent engine? Do the tendencies and characteristics of the times, which, in a day but recently past, brought into being theological seminaries and publication boards, reveal nothing more which the Church can justly do by the press? We venture the prediction, however it may now be regarded, that the day is not distant when the Church will have journals of every class, from the daily through all the intervening grades to the quarterly, which she can claim, in some proper sense, as her own; or which, at least, she can control to the extent that they shall be so conducted that she may have a solid security that their influence shall help to advance and not retard her great work, and so conducted, that for popularity and power they shall vie with any that the enemies of the Church can control. She should, through her ministry, and she should, through many of her laymen, be able to cope with any writers, in any sphere, and upon any subject, and put the enemies of the truth to rout, while she fights valiantly for her Lord.

The press, in our day, is the great educator of the world. Shall the Church ignore a fact so patent? She must bring it to coöperate with the pulpit and the school. One class of minds, not great in number but great in power—the thinking, reflecting, controlling—are swayed by the quarterly and the ponderous volume; another, and a larger class, more by the the monthly; a still larger, by the weekly; until you come down to the daily, which is the great educator of the masses of the people; the high and the low, not merely in politics and trade, but in morals and religion. As on entering a lordly mansion you may judge of the tastes of the proprietor by the paintings which are suspended from its walls and the statuary which adorns its grounds, so as to the mass of men you shall be able to tell their views of politics not only, but even of morals and religion, by the publications they con-

stantly read. Nor do they always make their selection from correspondences in sentiment upon questions previously and independently settled by themselves. New questions are daily arising on which they have no settled views. On these the masses follow the popular journals they read, whithersoever they may lead them, as certainly as the needle follows the magnet. This is the case with the vast multitude of readers; they read without reflecting, and decide without being able to render a reason. And who needs to be told that the common daily newspaper of our times discusses every subject of religion and morals, from the inspiration of the Scriptures and the genuineness of the sacred books, down through every doctrine of the Gospel and every ordinance of the Church? Is Sabbath observance agitated in any community, the wisdom of Sabbath laws discussed, their repeal urged, the propriety of closing dramshops or of stopping railway trains on that day canvassed? All this appears in the daily journals. And the profoundest questions relating to man's spiritual nature and destiny; whether, indeed, there be another world; whether man is a religious being, and, if so, what is true religion, with abundant evidence to show, to the satisfaction of multitudes, that the Church of Christ is a failure and its members hypocrites; and even the fundamental truth of all—whether there be a God—with plentiful intimations that the conclusion uttered in the fool's heart was right; with all that naturally flows from a trifling so wicked upon subjects so momentous, touching the whole theory of human society, its origin, nature, relations, interests, and duties; all these mighty themes are discussed and decided in the journals of the day, and very commonly in a manner to fall in with corrupt desires, and often in a style so singularly oracular, that multitudes sincerely believe, that from the conclusions announced, there is no escape. And in this manner proceeds the education of the surging, seething, numerically-controlling millions, in whose hands at the ballot-box and upon the battle-field, are held our political destinies not only, but whose influence at home contributes so largely to shape the moral and religious character of society. Can the Church, with these things before her daily observation, fail to see the importance, if not the vital necessity, of making

use of the press in a way she has not hitherto attempted? It is an old saying, which even the Church need not fear to apply, that we must fight the devil with fire. If he is to be met and discomfited here, it must be with his own weapons and upon his own ground. The press must be met by the press. Satan is the arch-enemy with whom the Church has to contend. Her power in the contest is the truth. The present question simply is, how she shall use it. That is left to her wisdom, guided by the providence of God revealing the character and tendencies of the times. These, we think, unmistakably point out the way which we have indicated.

Even the popular writers of fiction of our day have discarded the old methods of Walter Scott and Fennimore Cooper; and now, instead of issuing the volume, they have laid hands on the periodical press. Dickens is first read through his "All the Year Round;" and Thackeray's productions first appear in "The Cornhill Magazine;" and the effusions of the most popular writers of fiction in our own country, and some of those of Europe, are first seen by us in Harper, or the Atlantic Monthly, or other magazines of that class; and a lower order, but of wider circulation, are found in prints, of which the New York Ledger is a sample; while there is a wide and vastly-deep abyss below all this—a dread abyss!—into which we can not venture to descend, even in name. The aim of this whole class of writers is to reach the multitude and mold them to their will; and in order that they may reach them, they seek channels of communication, or create them, to which the multitude resort. Shall not the Church learn a lesson here from the world? Or, shall it be said to the very end of time, by way of rebuke, as in our Saviour's day: "The children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light?"

We may perceive how a concentration of church power may be brought into efficient action through the press, by drawing an illustration from the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a denomination, and under church control, they have quarterlies, monthlies, and weeklies. Their General Conference appoints the editors of all these. As they are church publications, their preachers, local and itinerant, are agents for their circulation, and by their rules are regularly called to account

for their diligence in this work. It can be seen at a glance, from such a system, how their entire people, and thousands who read their publications through the diligence of their members from the efforts made beyond their own communion, are impressed with their peculiar views; and what is more directly in the line of their great purpose as a church, this peculiar use of the press reveals, in great part at least, how it is that they exhibit such concentration of power and unity of action in all their strictly evangelical work. That body, in its action, is unquestionably the most compact organization in protestant christendom, and by virtue of this characteristic is able to accomplish far more than without it. Our present purpose does not require us to enter into any criticism upon certain radical features of their ecclesiastical system which contribute to the same end—as the absorbing and the wielding with a strong hand, of all power by their itinerant and local clergy, and above them by a small body of bishops, to the entire exclusion of the voice of the people—but we mean to indicate that one of the greatest levers by which the exclusive rulers are able to move the mighty mass of their membership in carrying out the behests of their imperial will, is the press and their peculiar manner of using it. We have not, however, drawn this illustration for the purpose of urging Presbyterians to adopt this method of employing the press. We know their characteristic love for independency of thought and individuality of action too well to suppose they would do this. Nor is it our opinion that they should. But while these qualities of our character are admirable and valuable within due bounds, we hazard nothing in saying that we might learn a lesson, even here, which would give our church, by a use of the press in a way which she does not now attempt, an efficiency among our own people, and a power in society at large, which we may in vain seek otherwise to wield. Although we have not the data at hand to verify the statement, it is probably true that the number of families in the Methodist Episcopal Church who either take or read some one or more of their own religious journals, approximates the whole number of families in their communion, at least in all the cities and towns; while, on the other hand, as we know from the facts in some of our largest and most wealthy congregations,

and from the actual knowledge which each pastor in our church possesses, or may easily gain among his own people, it is no doubt true that there are thousands of families in the Presbyterian Church, and many among them of the highest social position, who do not subscribe for, read, or see, a religious journal of our church, or perhaps of any kind, from one year's end to another. This we regard not merely the fault of the minister nor of the people thus destitute, but of the Church itself. The conductors of the press in our Church are doing a good and great work, and should be encouraged by our giving a wider circulation to their journals; but this is a work to which the Church herself should put her hand in a way not yet attempted, that she may exert a greater power, and reap a rich reward. If the popular press is the great mold of men's thoughts on all subjects, we should seek to employ it to the utmost of our power for Christ and his cause, or we lose the strongest hold upon the masses of the people. The details of the manner in which this engine should be used will readily be suggested to the wisdom of the Church whenever she is thoroughly convinced that she has a duty here to perform.

We pass by the notice of other agencies which contribute to shape the spiritual destinies of men, regarding educational institutions and the press as beyond competition the most powerful which the Church may properly and directly control. And in respect to these, we ought perhaps to guard our position from possible misapprehension. In saying that the Church, in the execution of her true and purely spiritual mission, should lay hold on these and other controlling agencies of society, we do not lose sight of what we have already laid down as a fundamental principle which is to be adhered to without qualification, that the ordinances proper of the Church—those, and those only, which are specially named in the word of God—are her *direct* reliance, under God and by the power of his grace, for evangelizing the world. The chief of these ordinances, as already stated, is the preaching of the Gospel by the ministry of Christ. Nothing can supercede this. All we have said, therefore, upon education, we urge with a thousand fold more emphasis in behalf of education for the ministry. All we have urged in favor of building

up and endowing institutions of every grade for our youth, we would press under the solemnity of a vastly higher obligation upon all the people of God, in behalf of the seminaries for training the ministry, and giving these schools of the prophets all the facilities which the embodied wisdom of the Church in her highest courts may deem requisite to meet the demands of the age in which we live. Let these instrumentalities be put in the first place of duty by the Church. Let nothing come in to rival or compete with them. The true ministry is directly an ordinance of God; its individual members are called of God; they are Christ's ascension gifts to his Church, and under grace and truth the greatest and best of all. Let the Church, then, recognize the superior obligation to train up a ministry for Christ, and provide all the ways and means thereunto, which these considerations impose. But while we give the ordinances proper of the Church their true place, we claim that the controlling agencies of society which we have mentioned should be used as auxiliaries to make all Gospel ordinances the more effective, by preoccupying the mind and heart of the world, through these means of dominant power, with thoughts and feelings favorable to, or at least not set against, a reception or candid hearing of divine truth. If any should object to the Church herself being concerned in employing the particular agencies named, that they are not specifically authorized by the word of God, we see not why, upon the same ground, our Publication Boards, Colportage systems, and Theological Seminaries, must not give place. But, on the contrary, as the whole earth has been given to the saints of the Most High God through the inheritance of his Son, for an everlasting possession over which Christ is to reign with them forever, most surely, every legitimate power the world contains may be siezed upon by the saints to subdue it to his rightful dominion!

If we have now justly apprehended the responsibilities of the Church, and have rightly judged of the means for the accomplishment of her true mission; if her work, in its good fruits, promotes so highly the welfare of men and the glory of God; and if the times on which we are thrown, in God's providence, call for deeper energy and more enlarged operations in every department of the Church's work, how obviously

do these things indicate the character of the ministry needed to lead the Church in such a mission and at such a time. They should be men of earnest piety, willing to meet opposition and persecution in any form, for the truth's sake, for humanity's sake, and for Christ's sake; men of apostolic zeal, boldness, and faithfulness, who show to all men, by the spirit that is in them, that they are called of God, and have, in their work, the witness and the fruits of the Spirit of God, seeking "not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified." They should be also men of eminent practical ability; not men of "genius," so called—let such men rather seek another sphere for the display of their eccentricities—but they should be men of strong common sense, a quality for the ministry next in value to piety; men who can adapt themselves to the world in which they are to work, to human nature and human society as they are; and who go forth to their labors under the power of the single conviction, that the Gospel system of grace, and that alone, can relieve mankind from their spiritual thralldom, and elevate them to the true enjoyment of the sons of God. They should, furthermore, be men of high attainments and thorough training in all that may aid them in vindicating, illustrating, and enforcing the word of God. The question has sometimes been raised, whether the standard of professional attainment should remain at the point settled long ago, or be elevated. Without entertaining the question of the time to be spent in professional study for the ministry, it is manifest that, if anything is to be learned from the present state of worldly science, from the aspects of every form of error, from the boldness of skepticism in high places in the Church itself, under the garb of peculiar reverence for the truth, and from a corresponding irreligion among influential portions of society—all which the Gospel is obliged to encounter in its progress among men—the standard of attainment should be advanced beyond that of former times. This is probably the conviction of all who are employed as instructors of candidates for the ministry, as well as of a large portion or nearly all of those who are actively engaged in the work; and those who may be eager to enter the ministry, and who feel restive under the course now marked out by the Church, will be of

the same judgment a few years hence. The present times, moreover, demand that the ministry should be men of unreserved consecration to their special work, looking solely to the grace of God to give their mightiest or their feeblest efforts success. Secular pursuits, as far as possible, should be avoided. Let the dead bury their dead. Let your farms and your merchandise be managed by others, and obey the apostolic injunction to a minister regarding his duties: "Give thyself wholly to them." These characteristics of the ministry, which the present age preëminently demands—earnest piety, eminent practical ability, high professional attainment, and unreserved consecration—it was, we doubt not, the aim of the founders of Danville Theological Seminary to seek and secure in the candidates who should enter its halls. This we may justly assume to be the aim of its faculty, its directors and trustees, its patrons and its friends. With these views, and animated in honest endeavors to realize them by an eye single to the glory of God, we may justly hope that our labors will meet the approbation of the Head of the Church, and be crowned with his blessing.

Fathers and brethren, such is the work of the Church; such is her true mission, set before us by her crucified and reigning Lord; such are the responsibilities which rest upon all who are to lead the Church in her work; such is the object, as one of the agencies employed, to which the school of the prophets in your midst is consecrated. May we each, in our lot, give to the great work that measure of ability with which God has endowed us, so that we may each receive at last the welcome plaudit: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant!"

ART. VII.—*A Manual of Worship suitable to be used in Legislative and other Public Bodies, in the Army and Navy, and in Military and Naval Academies, Asylums, Hospitals, etc., compiled from the forms and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian denominations, and jointly recommended by eminent Clergymen of various persuasions.* pp. 132. GEORGE W. CHILDS, Philadelphia, 1862.

THE compiler of this little volume is the Rev. Dr. Shields, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and among others who unite in recommending it, we notice the names of Drs. Hodge and Boardman (of our own church), Durbin (Methodist), Williams (Baptist), Bellows (Unitarian), Bishops Potter and McIlvane, and President Woolsey, of Yale, which are sufficient to evince that the work is regarded as eminently catholic in its character. It has been evidently prepared with great care.

If the question as to the use of a liturgy in our church, and by our ministers in the discharge of their official duties, is to be regarded either as open, or as settled in the affirmative, then we can understand why a work like this might be prepared and brought before the public by one of our clergymen. But we beg leave to say that the question, so far from being a mooted one in our denomination, has been from the first settled in the negative by the church *as a church*; that is, by a majority so great that the minority has been nowhere. The fact that in the time of the Reformation there was, here and there, in the Protestant Church, a man who supposed a liturgy to be desirable, and who was fearful of intrusting the management of the public service in the church to any and every minister without specific directions, proves just nothing at all in favor of such a form. All, without exception, had been accustomed to the use of a liturgy, and dispensing with it, and returning to the usage of the primitive church, was, in the state of case then existing, a matter of experiment. One of the fathers has observed that error may at times so prevail that truth itself would be an innovation. And so it was then. But the experiment has long ere this been fully made, and has proved satisfactory. And in view

of it our own branch of the Church of Christ has for more than two centuries rejected the liturgy. And it is hardly in place now, and, after three centuries of successful trial evincing the groundlessness of the aforesaid apprehension, to make that very apprehension itself the reason for attempting to return back to the practice which it sought to inaugurate, and which was a plain departure from the usages of the primitive church.

If, after the careful training which our church has ever demanded of her ministry before entering upon their sacred work, there have been found among them those who can not select appropriate portions of the Scriptures for any occasion whenever their services are required; and who can not, either there and then, or in a hospital, deliberative body, or anywhere else, pray without book; they have been heretofore advised by the church to unite with such denominations as use prayer-books. But if, on the contrary, our ministry do not require them; then we may with reason ask, Why should a pastor of one of our churches prepare such a work? Why should others of our ministry unite with Episcopal ministers in recommending its use? We say without hesitation that we view the whole procedure with feelings of decided disapprobation. In our view it seems like an attempt to establish a precedent contrary to the cherished views and settled practice of our church. And this can not be permitted. If persons who feel unable to conduct family worship without a form of prayer; and if others who, in the absence of a clergyman, may be called to officiate in the army or navy, at a burial, for instance, or in a hospital or deliberative body, are disposed to employ a prescribed form of prayer, let them use it; but this manual was prepared mainly to assist *clergymen* in the performance of their duties. And in this aspect of the case we object to it *in toto*, so far as the ministry of our church are concerned. It is an attempt to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear.

That this manual was prepared mainly for clergymen to assist them in performing their official duties, is obvious. We have "*A form of Divine Service for Public Occasions*," which service is, of course, conducted by clergymen. And another, "*Form of Daily Prayers in National and State Legislatures*;" all

of which bodies are provided with chaplains. We have other "forms" to be used in the army and navy, and for public thanksgiving, humiliation, etc., which were prepared, of course, for those whose appropriate duty it is to officiate on such occasions.

And then, moreover (unless we greatly mistake), in the "Form for Public Worship," the *audible responses* are provided for the congregation, "Deliver us, O Lord," "We beseech Thee, O Lord God." (See pps. 14-17). We know not whether this were really the design of the compiler, but, from the isolated position in which these expressions are formed (not wholly unlike that of the somewhat similar expressions in the English church service), such seems to have been the intention in regard to them. And if this be so, it certainly is a most unwarrantable attempt to innovate upon the recognized and established usages of our church.

Then as to the subject-matter of some of the prayers, we have decided objections to it. In praying for those in authority, there is undoubtedly no impropriety in designating them as *servants* of God. They possess and exercise in professed subordination to Him, authority which he has delegated to such. Hence Nebuchadnezzar, and even Nero, are thus designated in the Scriptures. But this, assuredly can not be regarded as a precedent to justify the application of this term to all men indiscriminately. And so, too, in regard to the terms "children of God," "brethren," etc. There may be a sense in which all men are children of God, as he is the Father of all; but in practical theology, the term has a distinct meaning, as when John says, in reference to Christians, "Now are we the sons of God;" and Paul, "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are *the children of God*; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." Can it be proper, then, in the solemn exercise of prayer, to ignore these distinctions, as is done in this manual? For example, in the prayer for the wounded, p. 68, they are called, "thy suffering children." And in the prayer for those under sentence of death for their crimes, p. 68, they (be they impenitent murderers, guerrillas, traitors, and the like) are named "thy servants who for their transgressions are appointed to die;" and these prayers are to be offered in the

presence of the individuals referred to. In like manner, also, in the burial service, pp. 102, 103, we have the following: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in his wise providence, to take out of this world *the soul of our deceased brother*, we, therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; *in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life*," etc. How would such language appear at the burial of the aforesaid impenitent criminals? See, also, the prayer after burial at sea, p. 106.

In like manner "at the funeral of a public personage," p. 96, we have the following Scripture, "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?" These words as applied to Abner, were literally true, but in what sense is a public personage who is neither an Israelite nor a Christian professor to be regarded as a prince and a great man in Israel? The same remark applies to the language used "at the funeral of a military personage, p. 97, "The beauty of Israel is slain upon thy high places"—language literally applicable to Saul and Jonathan. But in what sense can it now be deemed applicable to an ungodly or infidel commander? In the prayer for the bereaved friends, p. 99, they, also, are called "thy bereaved servants," though they may be ungodly, or infidels, or even atheists. We protest against such an utter misapplication of the words of eternal life.

It is indeed suggested by the compiler that any expressions which do not commend themselves may be easily omitted. But the question here is not about omitting them. It is as to the propriety of their being thus presented and recommended to be used. But our limits forbid us to go more fully into the matter now, and we hope there may be no occasion for resuming the discussion of the subject hereafter. L.

